DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 340 CE 022 975

AUTHOR Mitchell, Brenda
TITLE Evaluation of Home Visitations as a Part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Final Report.
INSTITUTION EPD Consortium D, Richardson, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY Texas Education Agency, Austin.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 169p.; Some pages may not reproduce well due to light type

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Home Economics Teachers; *Homemaking Education; *Home Visits; *Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

A survey of useful homemaking teachers in the state of Texas was conducted to identify the status of home visitations as a part of vocational homemaking education. All useful homemaking teachers (2,501) were mailed questionnaires which addressed specific concerns related to home visitations. Seventeen research questions provided the framework for development of the survey instrument. The first question evaluated variables which might be related to the percentage of students visited during the regular school year. Other research questions were concerned with qualitative aspects of home visitation as a part of vocational homemaking education. Analysis of the questionnaires returned by seventy-two percent of the teachers revealed that useful homemaking teachers believe that home visitations are somewhat important and should continue to be a part of homemaking programs, although they are not satisfied with the current status of home visits. Furthermore, it was concluded that a majority of the homemaking teachers perceived that school administrators considered home visitations as somewhat important or unimportant to the total vocational homemaking program at their schools. (Included in the appendixes is a copy of the research instrument.) (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177340

Final Report

An Evaluation of Home Visitations As a Part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas

A Project Funded by:

Texas Education Agency
Department of Occupational
Education and Technology

Research Coordinating Unit
Contract Number 99230132

Conducted by:

Brenda Mitchell, Principal Investigator
EPD Consortium for Northeast Texas
P.O. Box 1300
Richardson, Texas 75080

CE 022 975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract iv

Acknowledgements v

List of Tables vi

Chapter I - Introduction. 1

Statement of the Problem 1

Rationale 1

Research Questions 5

Background and Significance of the Study. 7

Definition of Terms. 12

Chapter II - Review of Literature. 16

Kinds of Projects Including Home Visitations . . . 16

Vocational Education and Home Economics Programs Including Home Visitations. 25

Paraprofessionals as Home Visitors. 28

Materials and Training for Home Visitors. 31

Factors Contributing to Success of Home Visitations . 35

Summary of Characteristics of Programs Including Home Visitations 39

Chapter III - Procedures for Collection and Treatment of Data. 49

Developing and Validating the Instrument. 49

Pilot Testing the Instrument. 52

Collection of Data 53

Treatment of Data 55

Chapter IV - Analysis of Data and Findings. 59

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

Chapter V - Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations 107

Appendix A - Cover Letter, Support Letter, and Letter of Transmittal Accompanying Research Instrument . 117

Appendix B - Vocational Homemaking Education Home Visitation Survey. 121

Appendix C - Chi Square Contingency Tables for the Variable Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year with Respect to Selected Variables. 126

Bibliography 152

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this research study was to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers. A panel of experts including useful homemaking teachers, homemaking supervisors, home economics teacher educators, school administrators, Texas Education Agency area and state staff members, and representatives of the Advisory Council for Vocational Technical Education and the Vocational Homemaking Teachers Association of Texas was involved in the development, validation, and pilot testing of the survey instrument. Seventeen research questions provided the framework for the study. The first question evaluated variables which might be related to the percentage of students visited during the regular school year. Other research questions were concerned with qualitative aspects of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

Every useful homemaking teacher and combination useful/gainful teacher in the state (2501) was included in the survey. Seventy-two percent of the teachers returned the questionnaires within a period of four weeks. Analysis of the collected data yielded frequencies, percents, and appropriate Chi Square Tests of Independence. Seventeen conclusions were reached in this study. They were the direct products of the research questions employed in providing direction for this study.

A major finding of this study was that useful homemaking teachers believe that home visitations are somewhat important and should continue to be a part of homemaking programs, although they are not satisfied with the current status of home visits. Recommendations for improving home visitations and for additional studies related to home visitations are made.

Included in the appendices are copies of the research instrument and the letters of transmittal for the project.

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An investigation of the magnitude described in this report necessitates the sincere interest and cooperation of many individuals and groups. First, I must acknowledge the support and interest of all of the useful homemaking teachers in the state who responded to the questionnaire. The high percentage of return of instruments in only four weeks with no follow-up was evidence of the teachers' concerns and commitment to Vocational Homemaking Education. I especially appreciated the many ideas and materials they shared related to the home visitation process.

Another group which devoted time and effort to the project was a panel of experts who assisted with the development, validation, and pilot testing of the instrument. These persons are listed in Chapter III of this report. Also, appreciation is expressed to vocational administrators/directors and vocational homemaking supervisors who distributed survey materials to teachers in their districts. But mostly I am indebted to Mrs. Elizabeth F. Smith, State Director of Homemaking Education, Texas Education Agency, for her interest and guidance during the project. Her support of the research study served to encourage the teachers' participation in the project.

Finally, I am indebted to Dr. Earl McCallon for his assistance in data processing and to Almarie Smith, Administrative Assistant, and the EPD secretarial staff for their contributions to the project.

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Panel of Experts for the Home Visitation Research Project	50
II.	Questionnaire Return Analysis by Frequency and Per Cent	55
III.	Research Questions Matched with Questionnaire Items	56
IV.	Chi Square Summary Table for the Variable Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Selected Variables Significant at .05 or Less Level of Significance	63
V.	Frequency and Percent Distribution of Responses to the Period Scheduled for Home Visitations	66
VI.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Home Visits at Times Other Than Designated Visitation Period	67
VII.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to the Time Spent on Home Visitations.	69
VIII.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Persons Who Are Present When the Home Is Visited	70
IX.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Whether the Same Home Is Visited More Than Once	72
X.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Contributions of Home Visitations.	73
XI.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution and Rankings of Responses to Main Purpose of Home Visitations	75

DO NOT FOLD THIS PAGE

Table		Page
XII.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Perceptions of the Importance of Home Visitations	78
XIII.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Perceptions of Administrators Opinions of the Importance of Home Visitations	80
XIV.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Encouragement Received to Conduct Home Visits from Selected Individuals	82
XV.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution and Rankings of Responses to Difficulties Related to Home Visitations	84
XVI.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Use of Information Gained in Home Visitations	87
XVII.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Alternative Methods of Contacting Home	90
XVIII.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Perceptions of the Importance of Home Experiences/Extended Learning Experiences	95
XIX.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Credit Received for a Course When No Home Experience is Completed	96
XX.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Preparation to Conduct Home Visitations	97
XXI.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Needs Regarding Home Visitations	98
XXII.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Satisfaction With Status of Home Visitations	102
XXIII.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Recommendations Regarding Home Visitations	104
XXIV.	Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Recommendations Regarding Home Experiences/ Extended Learning Experiences	127

8 DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

Table		Page
XXV.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Home-making I).	128
XXVI.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Home-making II)	129
XXVII.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Home-making III)	130
XXVIII.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Home-making LV)	131
XXIX.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Home and Family Living).	132
XXX.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Home Furnishings).	133
XXXI.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Home Management)	134
XXXII.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Home Nursing)	135
XXXIII.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Child Development).	136

DO NOT RUM THIS PAGE

Table		Page
XXXIV.	Four by Two Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Courses Taught (Consumer Education)	137
XXXV.	Chi Square Summary Table for the Variable Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Elements of Courses Taught.	138
XXXVI.	Four by Three Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Teaching Assignment (Full or Combination Unit)	139
XXXVII.	Four by Four Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Teaching Assignment (Months of Contract)	140
XXXVIII.	Four by Eleven Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Area of the State	141
XXXIX.	Four by Seven Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Community Size	142
XL.	Four by Seven Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Years of Teaching Experience	143
XLI.	Four by Four Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Degrees Earned	144
XLII.	Four by Three Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Preservice Training.	145
XLIII.	Four by Three Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Scheduling of Conference Period.	146

Table | Page

XLIV. Four by Three Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Scheduling of Conference Period. 147

XLV. Four by Six Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Distance Traveled to Home Visit 148

XLVI. Four by Three Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Adequacy of Travel Allowance for Making Home Visits. . . . 149

XLVII. Four by Three Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Needs for Addditional Travel Funds 150

XLVIII. Four by Five Chi Square Contingency Table for Percentage of Students Visited During the Regular School Year by Visits Made During Summer Homemaking Program 151

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were:

1. To develop and validate a survey instrument which would address specific concerns related to home visitations and which may be used as a model for future research studies in Vocational Education.
2. To survey the population of useful homemaking teachers in Texas to identify the perceived status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education.

Rationale

School superintendents, principals, vocational directors, homemaking supervisors, useful homemaking teachers and Texas Education Agency staff members have expressed concerns during the last few years regarding the role of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking programs in Texas. Useful

homemaking teachers in grades nine through twelve have been provided two conference periods each day. This is one more conference period than usually provided classroom teachers. The purpose of the conference periods as defined in the Vocational Homemaking Education Program Standards is:

> for the organization and supervision of the required home experiences of students; providing instructional programs for young and adult homemakers; sponsoring the Future Homemakers of America and Young Homemakers of Texas organizations in the school; securing and preparing instructional materials; compiling reports; and performing other duties necessary in the development and operation of the homemaking program. (11)

Home visitations are identified as an integral part of the Vocational Homemaking Education program as follows:

> The high school homemaking teacher has responsibility for class instruction; visiting homes; supervising home experiences; conferring with students and their families; directing Future Homemakers of America activities; working with young and adult homemakers, individually or in organized classes, or with Young Homemakers of Texas; and preparing instructional materials and reports. (11)

The home is identified as an integral part of the Vocational Homemaking Education program as follows:

> The classroom, home, and community shall serve as laboratories in which learning experiences take place. Additional learning experiences are provided through the Future Homemakers of America and Young Homemakers of Texas organizations. (11)

The home experience is identified as an integral part of the Vocational Homemaking Education program as follows:

> Supervision of home experiences is an integral part of homemaking education, and it is the homemaking teacher's responsibility to provide this guidance and direction. Supervision may be provided through visits in the home, through individual conferences, class progress reports, and class displays of individual work.

Home Experiences--Each student enrolled in homemaking education must conduct an approved supervised home experience program for a minimum of four weeks during each semester under the semester unit plan (80-minute periods) or during each quarter under the quarter unit plan (55-minute periods).

"Home Experience" is a term used to designate extended learning experiences conducted during the student's time away from school. With proper planning they may be carried out in a variety of locations within the community.

The intensity and depth of a home experience determines the time length--the experience should continue for a period that will allow for the development of skills and for growth and maturation. Home experiences should be evaluated according to the achievement of goals and plans established prior to the beginning of the experience, rather than in terms of time spent. Students who do not complete a home experience become ineligible to be counted toward allocation or reallocation of vocational homemaking teacher units. Local schools determine whether students pass or fail when they do not complete a home experience each semester or each quarter. (11)

Vocational homemaking teachers are reimbursed for vocational travel expenses for these purposes:

To confer with parents of students or prospective students:

(1) To explain objectives of the training program
(2) To determine attitudes of parents toward vocational training
(3) To review the progress of students in light of their vocational objectives
(4) To discuss special problems related to the instructional program

To organize and supervise instruction in approved vocational programs for in-school youth, out-of-school youth, and adults. (5)

By the above statements, home visitations for the purpose of supervising home experiences are clearly established as an integral part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

Vocational Homemaking Education is one of the only program areas in secondary education in Texas which provides school time and reimbursement of travel expenses for teachers to visit students' homes. At this time, when accountability in all areas of education is a major issue, the continuation of providing school time for homemaking teachers to conduct home visitations is being questioned. Home visitations are an expensive part of the Vocational Homemaking program; therefore, the cost effectiveness of home visitations needs to be established to justify continuation of this practice. For this reason, a primary focus of this study was the percentage of students visited by useful homemaking teachers. Research question number one attempted to identify variables which might be related to the percentage of students visited.

Since a study focusing only on the quantitative aspects of home visitations may have limited usefulness, this study also addressed a number of qualitative factors. A review of research studies and projects involving home visitations revealed several common factors which seemed to be related to the success of programs. These factors included identified purposes of home visits, supervision and support for home visitations, pre-service and in-service training for home visitors, and materials and procedures used during the home visit. Discussions with school superintendents, principals, vocational administrators, homemaking supervisors, useful homemaking teachers and Texas Education Agency staff members

confirmed these factors as concerns regarding home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Research questions two through 17 were formulated from the previously mentioned sources.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in this study:

1. Do relationships exist between the percentage of students currently being visited by useful homemaking teachers and variables such as:
    a. courses taught
    b. teaching assignment
    c. area of state
    d. community size
    e. years of teaching experience
    f. degrees earned
    g. pre-service training
    h. scheduling of conference period
    i. distance traveled to home visit
    j. funds allocated for travel
    k. visits made in summer program?
2. When are most home visits typically scheduled?
3. What is the average amount of time spent on a home visit?

4. Who is typically present when the home is visited?

5. Is the same home visited more than once during the school year?

6. What are the purposes and contributions of home visits as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?

7. How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) are home visits to the total vocational homemaking program?

8. How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) do school administrators consider home visits to be to the total vocational homemaking program?

9. To what extent do the following individuals encourage useful homemaking teachers to conduct home visitations:

   a. teacher educators
   b. other homemaking teachers
   c. homemaking department chairperson
   d. homemaking city supervisor
   e. vocational administrator/director
   f. area homemaking consultant
   g. school principal
   h. superintendent/assistant superintendent?

10. What difficulties do useful homemaking teachers encounter in making home visitations?

11. To what extent do useful homemaking teachers use the information gained in the home visit?
12. What alternative methods of contacting the home are being used by useful homemaking teachers?
13. How important are home experiences/extended learning experiences to the total vocational homemaking program as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?
14. Are additional resource materials and methods needed to assist useful homemaking teachers in making home visits?
15. Are useful homemaking teachers satisfied with the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education?
16. What are recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home visitations?
17. What are recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home experiences/extended learning experiences?

Background and Significance of the Study

Research studies and projects involving home visitations have been numerous and varied. However, the general objectives of most of the projects which included home visits were similar. In 1975, Lamont and Rice (7) reported these objectives for a Guidance Awareness Project involving home

visitations in a large city school:

> To try and narrow the gap between the home and the school preparing both students and parents for a productive high school experience, and to help the students gain decision making skills which will help them develop plans for the future.
>
> To give parents input into school goals and objectives.
>
> To identify handicapping features which might affect the student.
>
> To cause students to feel more at ease in the new high school environment.

In another study conducted by Weeks (12) in rural schools in 1972, the home visitor's role was defined in terms of these objectives of the project:

> To interpret the teachers' problems to the parents.
>
> To listen to the parents' side of the story.
>
> To pull together sources of help to alleviate home troubles that might be adversely affecting a child's school work.

Weeks concluded that the home visitor was "a vital link between home and school."

The National Home Start project (2), designed to serve low income families with young children, had as its objective to enhance the mother's ability to deal effectively with her children and to provide comprehensive social-emotional, health, and nutrition services. This program helped strengthen the parents' capacity for facilitating the general development of their children and involved parents directly in the educational development of their children. The above cited studies seemed to indicate that through home visitation and

parent intervention a variety of general objectives can be accomplished related to the educational process.

In many of the projects including home visitations, several school and project personnel were also involved in the total visitation process. Lamont and Rice (7) reported that 24 teachers, administrators, and counselors were involved in the total visitation process for the Guidance Awareness Project. Another School-Home Contact Program (3) involved family assistants, acting with deans and guidance personnel, principals and assistant principals, and teachers who worked with pupils who were not achieving their potential.

Deloria (2) also related that in the National Home Start project the home visitors were provided special preparatory assistance prior to the visit by the directors or specialists who also often accompanied them on the home visit. In this study the degree of home visitor supervision depended largely on the presence of a staff member whose primary responsibility was to provide supervision. Deloria found that both the amount of time spent on and the frequency of home visitor supervision were highly correlated with the presence of a staff member who was primarily responsible for the field supervision of home visitors.

Love (8), in evaluating the National Home Start project in 1976, reported that supervision provided to home visitors was inadequate. More in-home supervision was suggested rather

than supervision related to reporting and record keeping.

In A Guide for Planning and Operating Home-Based Child Development Programs (10), the following statement further supported the need for effective supervision of home visitations:

> Perhaps the single most important role in the development of a home based program is the role of supervision. No other factor is as critical, particularly at the beginning stages of operation, as the availability and quality of supervision for home visitors and staff.

Another aspect of the home vivistation which seemed to contribute to the success of projects was materials and procedures used during the visit. As an example, the Home-Oriented Preschool Education program (6), developed specific materials for the visitor to take into the home to read and discuss with parents. In addition to the home activity materials, the home visitor was responsible for planning and preparing many additional materials and home activities which involved children and parents during the home visit. The Guidance Awareness Program (7) also included a packet of orientation materials which were given to and discussed with students and their parents.

Deloria (2) reported that home visitors should be encouraged to follow a curriculum or format for each visit to insure that all major objectives were accomplished during the visit. However, no two visits were meant to be the same; they were specifically geared to the needs of the individuals being visited. Deloria also suggested that less home visit

time should be spent on general information and more time should be devoted to specific topics. The Home-Oriented Preschool Education: Home Visitor's Handbook (6) suggested the home visitor try to anticipate and prepare for questions which parents might ask and be alert to serious problems which could arise.

In addition to materials and procedures to use in conducting home visitations, some projects included staff development and in-service sessions to train the home visitor in the competencies necessary for effective visiting. In the final report of the School-Home Contact Program, Erickson (3) recommended additional in-service for home assistants for those projects which had limited or no in-service for the personnel visiting homes.

Deloria (1), in evaluating training received by home visitors, found that training concentrated on materials used during the visit, other preparations for the visit, and analysis of levels of interaction during the visit. Many of the projects had on-going in-service training for home visitors. As an example, an integral part of the preparation of visitors for the Home-Oriented Preschool Education Project (6) included time for home visitors to meet together to share experiences and success stories.

Some other common aspects of projects involving home visitations included evaluation, publicity and public relations follow-up activities, report forms, cost effectiveness, and

personal qualities of visitors. The projects and studies reported in the literature seemed to support the proposition that programs were successful, and students and parents benefited when the home environment was involved in the change process.

This study to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas has dual significance. First, the value of the home and community as laboratories in which learning experiences take place will be established. Second, the findings of the study will be useful to school administrators and Texas Education Agency staff members in making decisions related to home visitations and will identify means of improving home visits in homemaking education in Texas.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used.

Combination. An organization of instruction which combines two vocational instructional techniques (i. e., useful homemaking education and home economics cooperative education, useful homemaking education and home economics pre-employment laboratory education). (4)

Homemaking Education (Useful) Program. Courses of study in Texas public schools which provide instruction in the home economics subjects of child development, clothing and textiles, consumer education, family living, food and nutrition,

home management, and housing for high school students preparing for the occupation of homemaking and for adults wanting to improve knowledge and skills in the homemaking areas. Instruction assists youth and adults in solving immediate home and family living problems as well as problems related to establishing and maintaining homes. (11)

Home Experience/Extended Learning Experience. A learning experience which is conducted during the student's time away from school. (11)

Home Visit/Visitation. A visit with parents, guardians, and/or students which is conducted in the student's home.

Vocational Administrator/Director. One whose responsibilities extend to all facets of a district's vocational program under the jurisdiction of the district superintendent. These responsibilities include school and community relations, liaison between the district and the Texas Education Agency, recruitment and training of staff, planning and evaluation activities, curriculum design, and such other duties as the district superintendent may assign for the conduct of vocational education. (4)

Vocational (Homemaking) Supervisor. One who works under the direction of the vocational administrator and functions in a leadership capacity within a prescribed area of responsibility. Typically, a supervisor's leadership function is focused on a specific element of a school district's total vocational effort. (4)

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Deloria, Dennis and others, The National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report V: Summative Evaluation Results, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc., Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scop Educational Research Foundation, 1974.

2. Deloria, Dennis and others, The National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report V: Executive Summary--Policy Relevant Findings and Recommendations, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc. Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1974.

3. Erickson, Edsel and others, School-Home Contact Program, 1972-73: Final Report, New York, Teaching and Learning Research Corp., 1973.

4. Guide for Planning Vocational Programs in Local Education Agencies, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1976.

5. Guide for the Administration of Travel of Vocational Personnel in Public Schools, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1976.

6. Home-Oriented Preschool Education: Home Visitor's Handbook, Charleston, W. Va., Appalachia Educational Lab, 1972.

7. Lamont, Ken and Naomi Rice, Guidance Awareness Program Narrowing the Gap Between Home and School: Final Report, Bend School District 1, Oreg., 1975.

8. Love, John M. and others, The National Home Start Evaluation Final Report: Findings and Implications, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc., Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1976.

9. Love, John M. and others, The National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report VII: Twenty-Month Program Analysis and Findings, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1976.

10. Seefeldt, Carol and others, A Guide for Planning and Operating Home-Based Child Development Programs, Washington, D. C., Office of Child Development, 1974.

11. Vocational Homemaking Education Program Standards, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1978.

12. Weeks, Ramona, Attacking Education Problems in Rural Schools, Pinal County Schools, Florence, Ariz., 1972.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Kinds of Projects Including Home Visitations

Research studies and projects involving home visitations have been more numerous and varied than might be expected. In a search of the recent literature, 119 reports and studies identified home visitations as a major component of the program. The largest number of these reports was in the area of early childhood education and most of these were designed for special needs groups such as low income and educationally disadvantaged populations (5, 9, 10, 18, 19, 28, 33, 39, 46, 55, 56, 63, 64), mentally retarded or handicapped children (9, 47, 49), and bilingual or bicultural populations (51, 59).

Beebe (4) described a program conducted in 1966 in which parents and teachers worked as partners in the education of preschool children, both in a home and school environment. The aim of this program was to develop teaching skills in the parents, and at the same time, provide insights for the teacher into the child's needs. As a result of the cooperative efforts of teachers and parents, the child was provided with a wider range of learning opportunities. Similarly, Graves (21) described a six-week inservice training program for family day care mothers consisting of three components: (1) weekly small group meetings of the mothers to share ideas about child care

and to learn about child development and various home activties for children; (2) home visitations - informal discussions between the mother and a program team member who demonstrated home activities; and (3) a classroom child care program provided for the family day care children while the mothers were in weekly meetings.

Another parent participation program described by Sayler (52) in 1971 in the pamphlet "Parents: Active Partners in Education" reflected the belief that parent-teacher cooperation is essential for the best education for children. Specific steps that teachers can take to involve parents in the classroom, as well as some of the fears and attitudes that may influence the behavior and effectiveness of parents were presented. Suggestions were given to help teachers plan activities which were appropriate for parental help in class.

Financial limitations, staff availability, and poor parental attitudes were overcome in a program conducted by Ade and Hoot (2) in 1976. As a result of this parental involvement program and home visitations, mutual respect between the home and school was developed and parents were encouraged to maintain an influence in their children's lives. A parent home curriculum, which could be implemented in day care and early childhood education programs, was a major by-product of this program.

The Richmond, Virginia Follow Through program (19), which was funded primarily by Educational Opportunity Act Title II

funds, served a student population of whom the majority were black and from low income families. The program sought to improve the learning ability of the child as well as educate and involve the parent through a continuous program in which both home and school were integral parts of a single unit. The program provided educational, social and cultural experiences for the child and his family so that the child's entire environment became more conducive to learning. This was accomplished through several methods: the institution of a new kind of paraprofessional - the parent educator - into the classroom; weekly home visits in which the parent educator collaborated with the parent on an educational task program for the child; field trips for parents and children; and the fostering and encouragement of an active Parent Advisory Committee.

A similar home-based early childhood program conducted in the Memphis city school system in 1976 presented a rationale for early education and for parental involvement (9). The program involved educationally deprived three and four year olds in eight preschool centers located in Title I schools. A parent or significant caretaker of each child enrolled in the program visited the center with the child at least twice a month and also conducted learning activities brought to the home by a home visitor. The needs of each child were determined through administration of a locally

developed diagnostic instrument, with activities designed to fit these needs. Measurement of program results by the program evaluator confirmed the need for such an early childhood program.

Another innovative approach, introduced by Berlin and Berlin (5) increased parental involvement through learning games. Economically disadvantaged parents were taught to use games with their second grade children to increase their children's reading achievement. Findings indicated that interaction between parent and child increased, encouragement and approval from the parent was greater, and parental interest in his/her child's abilities and progress increased. On the basis of these findings, a model elementary school program was proposed in which an intermediary teacher teaches parents methods of helping children learn to read. These methods seemed to be a way of reversing the trend toward non-learning and early failure among young disadvantaged children.

A study conducted in 1972 by Shelton (55, 56) was undertaken to determine if economically deprived students' behavior, attendance, and achievement would improve as a result of teacher-parent dialogue and contact. This study was based on the assumption that low-income parents could be trained to train middle-class teachers to communicate effectively with parents and children living in low-income neighborhoods. The result of this investigation indicated that children's

average daily attendance and achievement could be significantly increased by Family Involvement Communication System (FICS) training.

An experimental nursery school program in the Philadelphia School District (46) in 1965 helped disadvantaged children overcome some of the handicaps which hindered their educational, social and emotional development. Featured in this instructional program were learning experiences to develop the child's language facility, to improve visual and auditory discrimination, and to increase attentiveness. Other educational experiences were designed to enhance the child's self-image and to increase his basic knowledge of science, mathematics, social studies, and health. Additional research was recommended to determine the impact of the program on pupils' social and intellectual functioning and on their attitudes toward learning and testing.

These reports document the contribution of parental involvement toward overcoming the limitations of a deprived environment. Innovative approaches have facilitated open lines of communication between school and home and ultimately have enhanced the educational growth of disadvantaged youngsters.

Just as teachers of disadvantaged children found the home to be a vital link in the education process, teachers of physically handicapped and mentally retarded children have reported similar findings. In an attempt to improve procedures for reporting the progress of mentally handicapped children

in special classes, the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction (49) developed guidelines to explain the intent and design of report cards. In addition to report cards, parent-teacher conferences and home visitations were utilized to communicate academic progress, personal and social progress, and subjective information. In 1965 Charney and LaCrosse (8) devoted an entire chapter to the topic of home visitations in their handbook of basic information for prospective teachers of mentally retarded children. Case studies describing a teacher's visits to the homes of some of her students and the parental reactions to her visits were presented. From these reports it seems that parental involvement, and particularly home visitations, are an important part of educational programs for handicapped children. Rafael (47) stated that a home visit is an essential preadmission procedure in teaching exceptional children.

In addition to early childhood education programs, a variety of other projects was identified which included home visitations as a part of the program delivery system. A number of guidance and counseling programs at the junior high and high school levels reported the use of home visitations to disseminate information (1, 13, 14, 15, 35, 42, 48). A summer visitation program designed to facilitate orientation of sixth graders about to enter junior high school was described by Rash (48). In this program the counselor visited each new seventh grader at his home, met with him and his parents and

discussed realistic goals for the student based on his records and on the parents' aspirations. Another guidance program reported by Lamont (35) in 1975 was designed to prepare both students and parents for a productive high school experience. The overall goals of the Guidance Awareness Program were: increasing decision-making ability and goal formulation at the sophomore level, expanding the guidance program to include the parent and home situation, increasing community support for school programs, and providing a model career guidance program. A visit was made during the summer to the home of each incoming sophomore student.

Peterson (42) outlined a similar career guidance program conducted in 1974 for grade ten students. As a result of this study, a recommendation was made to employ guidance tutors (graduate students from the university) for home visits.

The Home-School Contact Program (13, 14), which also included home visitations, provided a link between home and school for senior high school students who show serious problems in school attendance, adjustment and/or achievement. Home visitations were made to teach the parents what to expect from the school, and how to help their children achieve in school.

It is evident that a variety of educational programs at all levels, preschool through high school, provides services to parents and students through home visitations. A large number of projects which included home visitations were

designed as public relations programs (6, 16, 24, 25, 27, 54, 58, 60, 66, 67). Brooks (6) reported in 1975 an open home night program which was implemented to increase the contact between parents and staff. This program which devised a series of meetings in the homes of parents replaced the Back-to-School Night program. Another program which significantly improved community-school relations employed paraprofessionals as community public relations agents (16). These persons assisted in attendance records, made frequent home visits, and acted as hostesses for parents visiting the school.

Other examples of the use of home visitations to improve relationships between parents and the school contributed to major changes in the school program such as integration and implementation of multi-age grouping. An evaluation of the outcomes of a year of desegregated education in the Redlands Unified School District, California (54) in 1970, indicated that home-school cooperation did exist. However, more home visits were requested by parents and teachers alike. Home visitations were identified as a factor which improved the quality of education during the continued period of transition.

In 1973, when the Hachensach Public Schools in New Jersey (27) implemented a new program for multi-age groupings in open-spaced schools, a multi-faceted informational approach was developed. The school staff believed that good public relations called for parents to participate in helping to develop the program and the climate for improved learning.

Home visitations, as well as a citizen advisory council, mini-teas, parent workshops, individual parent-teacher conferences, and open houses, were conducted as a part of this open-door policy.

The National Education Association has published Working With Parents, A Guide for Classroom Teachers and Other Educators (67) which is based on the concept that education is a responsibility shared among school, teachers and parents. Suggestions are made for teacher facilitation of good student-parent-school relations. Home visits are presented as one of the ways that parents can be encouraged to appreciate, respect and care for the school program and to offer support and assistance to their children in that program.

Programs involving home visitations also serve adult populations. One of these projects, (POR FIN) (44), was undertaken in San Antonio, Texas in 1971, to develop a recruitment approach which would be more effective than the traditional mass media approach in recruiting hard-core undereducated individuals into adult education classes. A face-to-face interview technique and support materials were utilized during home visitations. The face-to-face recruitment technique was found to increase significantly the number of individuals enrolled into class, as opposed to nonpersonal methods of recruitment.

The variety of programs and projects which contact the home through a home visitation is extensive. Programs for the

prevention of child abuse, for the home bound elderly, rehabilitation programs for troubled youth, programs providing nutrition and health services, infant development programs, library awareness programs, and nursing programs are examples of the wide range of populations served by home visitation programs.

Vocational Education and Home Economics Programs Including Home Visitations

In the area of vocational education, agricultural education programs at the secondary school level include a home visit or farm visit as part of that program. In 1976 Van Berkum (61) described seven kinds of student visitations: scheduled visits; requested visits; unannounced visits; a learning experience for the instructor visits; public relations visits; booster visits; and the welcome or hardship visit. In another 1976 article entitled "Home Visitation - A Chance for Counseling", Crosen (11) presented ideas for improving the effectiveness of home visitation of students by vocational agriculture instructors. The suggestions for improvement focus on planning for the visit, getting to know the student, assessing the home situation for influencing factors, using home responsibilities for plant and animal care as learning experiences, and considering life goals.

Five home economics programs including home visitations were identified (3, 15, 43, 45, 50), four of which were conducted by a paraprofessional rather than a home economist.

In Alabama, nonprofessional program assistants were chosen to conduct educational programs for low income homemakers (45). An Educational Specialist and the county home economist assumed administrative and supervisory responsibilities for the program. Instruction was provided through a working visit, a one-to-one teaching method in the homemakers' home, taught by telling, showing, and repeating a skill. Each visit was designed to meet the specific interests and needs of the homemaker at her economic, educational, and skill level. It was found that personalized informal learning experiences helped deprived young homemakers raise their level of living, encouraged mothers and families to grow out of the relief cycle, and raised self-esteem, hopes and aspirations. Improvement in homemaker skills resulted in cleaner homes, improved eating habits, and better family relationships.

Another similar training model is available through the Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service (43, 50). These materials are designed to present ideas for training nonprofressional workers to help low income families improve homemaking skills. Guidelines are furnished for program planning and implementation.

Home economics agents in Oklahoma were involved in a federally funded program to train older women as visiting homemakers (3). Upon completion of the training course, these women were hired by families, by nursing homes, as home repairers, and as contact persons in Operation Medicare Alert.

As a result of this program, the concept of job qualifications in relation to age was abolished and new fields of employment and vocational training for older workers were created.

Only two reports were identified which related to home visitations as a part of homemaking education at the secondary level. Patterson (41) reported a student teaching program in home economics designed to produce homemaking teachers who could quickly become acquainted with a community, adapt teaching to it, and locate and use local resources. An evaluation of this teaching approach concluded that home visits were the best way to learn about homes and families. A follow-up of former students revealed that a majority judged the student teaching program to be effective in preparing them to teach units in relation to community conditions and student background.

Since homemaking students are encouraged to make practical applications at home of principles learned in class, extended learning experiences are an integral part of many homemaking education programs. A guide to help the homemaking teacher plan for learning experiences which extend beyond the classroom was developed by the Home and Family Life Division, Washington State Board for Vocational Education (23). Suggestions, illustrations, charts, and forms are provided for introducing, interpreting, setting standards, planning, supervising and

evaluating all phases of the program. These beliefs were stated regarding Extended Learnings:

1. Visiting homes is essential for guidance of extended learnings. Teachers should take time in class, as well as out of class, to help students plan for the Extended Learning.

2. The teacher needs to know the people who will be assisting the student with out-of-class learnings.

3. The teacher needs to know about the Extended Learning as it progresses.

4. Teaching is effective when students use principles at home which have been taught at school.

5. Extended learnings seem to result in experiences at home suited to individuals and families.

The lack of identified studies related specifically to home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking education is an indication of the need for and significance of this present study.

Paraprofessionals as Home Visitors

In the identified studies which included home visitations as a major component, a variety of personnel assumed the role of home visitor. Vacanti (60) reported in 1977 a training model which used parent educators who served as home visitors on a volunteer basis. The model could be used by teachers, paraprofessionals, or other adults who wanted to develop home learning activities that meet the individual needs of children. In 1974 Thomas (59) also recommended the use of parents as paraprofessionals to establish home/school continuity (the

degree of similarity between the child's experiences at home and at school). The Richmond, Virginia Follow Through program (19) instituted a new kind of paraprofessional, the parent educator, into the classroom. Similarly, Graves (21) described a program which trained mothers to provide day care services for their own children. These programs were exemplary in nature and served as models for establishment of additional programs using parents as educators.

Many of the identified programs employed paraprofessionals or nonprofessionals to conduct home visitations (3, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 25, 26, 28, 29, 43, 45, 50). In A Creative Approach to Special Staffing Problems: Staffing for Better Schools Under Title I (10) the focus was on staff quality and utilization. Ideas were presented for recruiting, training, and utilizing teaching aides - either paid or volunteer - to extend the aims of the professional teaching staff and to develop new methods of productive ties with the community.

Two similar early childhood education programs (9, 29) used paraprofessionals under the supervision of a head teacher. Once a week the home visitor visited parents of the children they were responsible for in the preschool center. The head teacher was responsible for center administration, supervision of home visitors, and conducting the center's classroom activities.

At the secondary level, the School-Home Contact Program (13) used one hundred family assistants to contact the homes

of senior high school students who exhibited serious problems. The family assistants who were recruited from the target neighborhoods worked five hours a day, and when home visits were not possible in the daytime, evening or weekend visits were arranged and made.

Another secondary program reported by Hicks (25) trained indigenous nonprofessional aides to perform auxiliary noninstructional services and to act as liaision personnel between the school and community in disadvantaged East Saint Louis, Illinois. These aides made home visits, conducted surveys, and provided the parents with information about school programs and personnel, and services available from social agencies. An evaluation of this project showed that the aides established good rapport with teachers and the community but were not successful in changing the negative parental attitudes about student-teacher relations and the educational quality of the schools.

Another program also using unemployed or underemployed women as visiting homemakers in disadvantaged homes reported positive results. Although findings showed that the more disadvantaged women worked better as visiting homemakers, it was felt that with sound training, good supervision, and careful placement, other homemakers could also contribute to the rehabilitation of many families. A recommendation was made that an additional two weeks of classroom study in home

economics, social work, and psychology be added, as well as more on-the-job training.

Materials and Training for Home Visitors

Although there was evidence that paraprofessionals could be effectively utilized as home visitors, supervision and training of home visitors seemed to be key factors whether the visitor was a professional or nonprofessional. A large number of the identified programs utilized professional personnel (teachers, counselors, social workers, administrators) as home visitors (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67). Of these programs, approximately one-half provided specific training for professional personnel related to conducting home visitations (7, 8, 22, 24, 25, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 49, 52, 54, 55, 56, 62, 63, 64, 65).

A number of the training programs were designed as part of the preservice education of prospective teachers. In the In-Home Early Childhood Project (7), students in an early-childhood teacher training program were assigned to a family with one or more children of preprimary age. The student was asked to assess the family's behavior and needs and to devise techniques and materials to meet the needs. A trial kit of learning materials was prepared after the first two visits to the home, followed by a second permanent kit for circulation during the rest of the project. Students also planned a group session

which brought together several children and parents. This four month teacher training program was in lieu of the regular kindergarten lab.

The Home-Oriented Preschool Education (HOPE) program (39) used television, a mobile classroom, and parental instruction to educate three, four, and five year olds. A ten day pretraining period for the program members was conducted utilizing the Personnel Training Guide. A team instruction approach was followed to accomplish the goals of the inservice training.

In Preparing Teachers to Involve Parents in Children's Learning, Jones (33) documented and evaluated the process of staff-teacher and teacher-parent interaction in terms of the kinds of resources, supervision, and support which may be needed by teachers making home visits. A resource center for teacher-visitors and strategies for promoting innovation were based on the premise that teachers who were offered choices among resources and strategies were more likely to offer similar choices to families.

In discussing evaluation of preschool compensatory education programs Weikart (63) stated in 1969 that although the role of curriculum is primarily to help the teacher teach and the selection of curriculum is critical, staff development and involvement are more important than the particular curriculum used. He identified two necessary ingredients in planning inservice training for home visitors: planning time for teachers

and evaluation of systematic language interaction between teacher and child. Other programs emphasized the need for preparation of home visitors which included purposes, problems, and evaluation of home visitations. In an inservice training program for teachers of mentally retarded children (49), parent-teacher conferences were discussed in terms of preparing for and conducting the conference and teacher qualifications for conducting the conference. In Parents: Active Partners in Education, Sayler (52) concluded with a summary of problems which may be encountered, and she enumerated teacher fears and rewards in a parent participation training program.

Materials to take into the home when conducting a visit were included in several of the programs (8, 22, 24, 26, 36, 42, 44). Such materials were the basis for activities conducted during the visit. In 1972 Greenwood (22) described the development of materials for family use which take into account not only the school's goals for the child but also the family's expectations, goals, life style, and value system. Materials for working with parents and children in the HOPE program (26) included get-acquainted activities, the planning of a "junk box" and "idea bank", and "do's and don'ts" to remember. Appendices to the Home Visitor's Handbook for project HOPE included a sample home visitor's newsletter, a sample parent's guide, a home visitor's feedback information form, a child data enrollment form, the home visitor mileage

and time report form, and a list of materials for the home visitor's kits. Another training manual, Learning: A Cooperative Adventure, A Resource Guide for Working with Young Children (36) contained a section on books, magazines, and records which offered ideas for learning activities.

Several guides were developed for the purpose of implementing programs involving home visitations. In designing the home visitor's training program, Seefeldt (53) suggested these steps, "break each job down into a list of its component parts, listing all the functions, responsibilities, and tasks that are involved. Then, by identifying all the knowledges and skills needed for the successful performance of each component part, a comprehensive check list can be derived that will show what subjects and topics to include in planning the training content." Below are listed two outlines for planning training for home visits:

Getting Ready

- Ready Answers When Parents Ask
- Learn the Territory
- Sharing Information Obtained
- Help Parents Understand the Program
- Scheduling Home Visits
- Making Notes - Keeping Records
- Materials to Take
- Do's and Dont's

Be Alert to Serious Problems

Home Visit Feedback Information (26)

Planning/Preparation

Deciding on Goals/Objectives/Strategies

Ice Breakers - Greetings

Materials

Planning to Resolve Special Problems

Studying the Neighborhood

Making Appointments in Advance

Dressing Suitably

Importance of a Confident Frame of Mind (53).

Factors Contributing to Success of Home Visitations

In addition to the factors contributing to successful home visitation which were introduced in Chapter I of this research report, others also exist. One important factor was related to publicity and public relations campaigns. In the identified programs, several efforts were implemented to communicate the philosophy and outcomes of the projects to the community and to gain public support for the programs. As an example, one study recommended that "an effective campaign should be organized and carried out for informing the community in general, and target population parents in particular about the program's purpose, goals, and objectives, and what can be expected of it." (53)

Follow-up activities are another factor which can contribute to the effectiveness of programs involving home visitations. Many of the programs included follow-up activities which were planned after the initial home visit. Often several visits were made to each home participating in the program. In the Guidance Awareness Program (35), special assembly programs were conducted for students during the school year. However, in this study, the home visits were evaluated as more successful than the large group sessions. Difficulties with follow-up sessions included problems related to monitoring the attendance of the students and loss of the one-to-one relationship with the advisor. The National Home Start Study (37) also supplemented the home visits with monthly group activities for parents and children. These follow-up activities were found to be successful, possibly because information regarding group activities was discussed and explained during the initial home visits.

Flexible scheduling of home visits was another factor which contributed to the success of programs. In the identified studies, home visitations were made during regular school or work hours, as well as at night and on weekends. Some projects recommended that additional time was needed to conduct visits (14). Many of the home visitors were only part time paraprofessionals or regular school personnel with limited time for home visits. A general recommendation for several projects was that the home visitors be full-time

personnel with reduced case loads. Availability to work some evenings and weekends was also listed as a consideration influencing the success of the home visitor (53).

Cost effectiveness of programs was also considered to be important for program success. Programs could not be recommended for continuation if cost effectiveness could not be proven. Cost per visit was determined and compared to other methods of contacting families and administering services. The National Home Start Evaluation Study (12) asked if funding of the Home Start Study was wise. In most respects the answer was affirmative. However, with respect to internal improvements in cost effectiveness that could be made within the existing program, these concerns were identified - content of the home visit, use of staff time, and allocation of budget funds. Funding was a major problem in most of the identified programs, and recommendations were usually stated in terms of whether funding should be continued.

Report forms and other materials for record keeping were necessary for monitoring the success of the home visitation process. General report forms included information such as name of student or child, parents' names, home address, phone number, date and time visited, hours spent, reasons not visited, and other comments (35). One project director stated, "Every home visitor should make a report, in detail, on every home visit. The importance of this cannot be stressed too much." (53) Another form included information regarding materials taken on

visits, persons present during the visits, factors affecting accomplishment of the plans, progress made, problems identified, and plans for the next visit. Survey instruments were also developed and administered to monitor the effectiveness of home visitation programs and to make suggestions for improvements. Visitors, parents, and students completed questionnaires, and in some cases, students or children and parents were tested before and after the home visitation program (12). Many examples of survey instruments were included in the appendices of the identified programs.

Another factor which seems to be related to the success of programs was the personal qualities of the home visitor. Concerns were often expressed by project directors regarding ways to instill motivation, understanding and confidence in the home visitor. In most cases, well-trained participants who were aware of their responsibilities as well as the expectations of the project made enthusiastic, competent home visitors. Other personal qualities of successful home visitors included relating effectively with many different people, maturity, sensitivity, flexibility, empathy, and cultural background. Language facility, availability to work some evenings and weekends, sex of visitor, age, health and energy, education, transportation, and discretion were also important considerations. In 1976 Love (37) compared home visitors on such variables as individual case load, being a parent or not, length of time with the program, age of children and location

of her home. There were many factors that influenced the success of the home visitor, and it was the responsibility of the director or supervisor of the project to select persons as home visitors who were well suited to the important responsibilities they assumed.

Summary of Characteristics of Programs Including Home Visitations

Home visitations are often included in programs providing services to individuals and families. Based on the review of the previously mentioned reports and studies, these charateristics seem to be common for programs including home visitations:

1. Paraprofessionals, as well as professionals, including teachers, administrators, counselors and social workers have responsibility for conducting home visitations.

2. Young children and special needs groups (disadvantaged, handicapped, and the aged) are the populations most commonly receiving services which include home visitations.

3. Supervision and evaluation of the home visitors are essential for the successful operation of programs.

4. Specific goals and objectives of home visitations are stated and communicated to parents or individuals.

5. Training and staff development activities for the home visitor are necessary to develop skills and competencies for conducting home visits.

and home visitations were considered an integral and important part of these programs. Furthermore, the majority of the programs were evaluated as effective in accomplishing the project's goals and objectives.

6. Materials related to the services of the program are prepared and taken to the home by the visitor.

7. Reporting and record keeping are important duties of the home visitor.

8. A public relations campaign often is conducted to inform the public and potential audience of the program including home visitations.

9. Cost effectiveness must be proven for continued funding to be recommended.

10. A variety of alternative methods are used to contact families and individuals in addition to home visitations, and several contacts are made with the home.

11. The amount of time spent on the home visitation varies; however, at least one hour is usually spent on the visit.

12. Homes are visited at times other than during regular school or work hours.

13. The format of the home visit is planned in advance to meet the specific needs of the individuals being served.

14. Mothers are the persons most often contacted on home visits and home visitors are usually women.

15. Training models and guides are available for planning and implementing programs which include home visitations.

In summary, the projects and studies reported in the literature indicated that a variety of programs provide services to families and individuals through home visitations,

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "Accountability: Home and School Visitor," Journal of International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers, Vol. 18, No. 2 (March, 1974), pp. 135-141.

2. Ade, William and James L. Hoot, "Parent Involvement: Motivation vs. Alienation," Day Care and Early Education, Vol. 4, No. 2 (November/December, 1976), pp. 19-20.

3. Ash, Lane and others, "New Fields of Employment and Vocational Training for Older Workers. Panel and Workshop V," unpublished papers presented at the National Conference on Manpower Training and the Older Worker, Washington, D.C., January 17-19, 1966.

4. Beebe, Marian K., "Teachers and Parents Together," Today's Education, Vol. 65, No.3 (September/October, 1976), pp. 74-79.

5. Berlin, Roxie and Irving N. Berlin, School's Training of Parents to be Effective Teachers of Their Own and Other Nonlearning Children, Seattle, University of Washington, 1973.

6. Brooks, B. David, "An Open Home Night - A Worthwhile Communication Vehicle," Journal of Educational Communication, Vol. 1, No. 2 (September/October, 1975), pp. 18-19.

7. Campbell, Sheila D. and Lorene M. Everett, In Home Early Childhood Project, Final Report, Edmonton, Department of Elementary Education, Alberta University, October, 1974.

8. Charney, Leon and Edward LaCrosse, The Teacher of the Mentally Retarded, New York, John Day Co., 1965.

9. Conley, Virginia, "Come on, Parents, Participate," unpublished paper presented at Interdisciplinary Conference on Parenting, Atlanta, Georgia, February 21-22, 1977.

10. A Creative Approach to Special Staffing Problems: Staffing for Better Schools Under Title I, Washington, D.C., Education Service Bureau, Inc., 1970.

11. Crosen, Roger L., "Home Visitation - A Chance for Counseling," Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 48, No. 12 (June, 1976), p. 282.

12. Deloria, Dennis and others, The National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report V: Executive Summary - Policy Relevant Findings and Recommendations, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc., Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1974.

13. Erickson, Edsel and others, Final Report of the Evaluation of the 1970-71 School-Home Contact Program, New York, Teaching and Learning Research Corp., 1971.

14. _____, Final Report of the Evaluation of the 1971-72 School-Home Contact Program, New York, Teaching and Learning Research Corp., 1972

15. Faulkner, Rosemary, Description and Evaluation of Training Program for Visiting Homemakers, Montauge, Prince Edward Island NewStart, Inc., 1971.

16. Gant, Walter L. and Greta I. Gustavson, "Home-School-Community: A Catalyst," Journal of International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers, Vol. 18, No. 2 (March, 1974), pp. 124-130.

17. Gilbert, Freeda M., "Home-School Counselor Assumes Important Role with Students, Parents," Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Spring, 1971), pp. 50-52.

18. Gilmer, Barbara R. and others, Intervention with Mothers and Young Children: A Study of Intrafamily Effects, Nashville, Tenn., Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education, George Peabody College, 1970.

19. Gordon, Edmund W. and others, Ira Gordon Follow Through (Richmond, Virginia), New York, Columbia University, 1972.

20. Gordon, Ira J. and others, "Continuity Between Home and School: Aspects of Parental Involvement in Follow Through," unpublished paper presented at the Biennial Southeastern Conference on Human Development, Atlanta, Georgia, April 27-29, 1978.

21. Graves, Vivian, and others, Training Program for Family Day Care Home Mothers in the Pontiac Area, Rochester, Mich., School of Education, Oakland University, 1974.

22. Greenwood, Gordon E. and others, Assistance to Local Follow Through Programs, Annual Report, Gainesville, Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Institute for Development of Human Resources, Florida University, December, 1972.

23. Guidelines for Extended Class Learnings, Olympia, Home and Family Life Division, Washington State Board for Vocational Education, 1971.

24. Hager, Donna L. and others, Community Involvement for Classroom Teachers, Charlottesville, Virginia, Community Collaborators, July, 1977.

25. Hicks, Leo B., An Experiment in School-Community Relations, Charleston, West Virginia State Commission on Mental Retardation, August, 1967.

26. Home-Oriented Preschool Education: Home Visitors Handbook, Charleston, W. Va., Appalachia Educational Lab, 1972.

27. Home-School Interaction: Project LEM, Hachensack Public Schools, New Jersey, 1973.

28. Home Start Evaluation Study, Interim Report III: Evaluation Plan 1973-74, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc., Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, August, 1973.

29. Home Visiting Handbook, Lakewood, Colo., Jefferson County Public Schools, 1976.

30. Honig, Alice S., Parent Involvement in Early Childhood Education, Washington, D.C., National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1975.

31. Horn, Gunnar, "Home Visits," Today's Education, Vol. 59, No. 6 (September, 1970), pp. 44-46.

32. Huebner, Robert, "Planning and Assessing Accomplishment in Home-Based Intervention Programs," Child Welfare, Vol. 55, No. 10 (December, 1976), pp. 691-702.

33. Jones, Elizabeth J., Preparing Teachers to Involve Parents in Children's Learning, Project Report, Pasadena, Cal., Pacific Oaks College, 1970.

34. Lambie, Dolores Z. and others, Home Teaching with Mothers and Infants, Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1974.

35. Lamont, Ken and Naomi Rice, Guidance Awareness Program: Narrowing the Gap Between Home and School, Final Report, Bend School District 1, Oregon, June, 1975.

36. Learning: A Cooperative Adventure, A Resource Guide for Working with Young Children, Phoenix, Arizona State Department of Education, September, 1975.

37. Love, John M. and others, The National Home Start Evaluation Final Report: Findings and Implications, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc., Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1976.

38. Murphy, Con, National Adult Education Survey, Interim Report, Dublin, Ireland, Ministry of Education, April, 1970.

39. Nardo, Nita, Home-Oriented Preschool Education: Personnel Training Guide, Charleston, W. Va., Appalachia Educational Lab, 1972.

40. Newbury, David N., "Community Education: Strategy for District-Wide Programs," Educational Leadership, Vol. 33, No. 5 (February, 1976), pp. 340-343.

41. Patterson, Irene, A Community Approach to Student Teaching, Research Report Number IV, College of Home Economics at Cornell University, State University of New York, June, 1966.

42. Peterson, M. Larry, The Effect of a Career Guidance Program Involving Teachers and Parents of Tenth Grade Students, Final Report, Logan City Board of Education, Utah, December, 1974.

43. Pope, Edward V., Human Relations in Training Aides - A Guide for Extension Agents, Washington, D.C., Federal Extension Service, Department of Agriculture, July, 1969.

44. POR FIN (Program Organizing Related Family Instruction in the Neighborhood), San Antonio, Texas, Bexar County Adult Continuing Education Program, 1971.

45. Priester, Jeanne, "An Identification of Effective Methods to Employ in Conducting an Educational Program to Reach and Teach Low-Income Young Homemakers in Rural Areas," unpublished paper presented at the National Seminar on Adult Education Research, Chicago, 1968.

46. Progress Report of the Experimental Nursery School Program, 1964-65, Philadelphia School District, Pa., Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement, 1965.

47. Rafael, Berta, "The Advantages of Home Visits as a Pre-Admission Procedure," Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Fall, 1970), pp. 12-16.

48. Rash, Dennis, "Know Your New Counselees Before School Begins," School Counselor, Vol. 18, No. 2 (November, 1970), pp. 133-134.

49. Reporting Pupil Progress in Special Classes for the Mentally Retarded, Special Education Curriculum Development Center, An Inservice Training Program, Des Moines, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Iowa City, Iowa University, October, 1968.

50. Rouls, Janalyce and others, Training Home Economics Program Assistants to Work with Low Income Families, Washington, D.C., Federal Extension Service, Department of Agriculture, November, 1965.

51. Samples of Parent Permission Slip for Bus Trips, Sample of Home Visitation Report Form, and Sample of Letter to Parents Requesting a Home Visitation Used with Project Head Start, El Paso Public Schools, Texas, 1965.

52. Sayler, Mary Lou, Parents: Active Partners in Education, A Study/Action Publication, Washington, D.C., American Association of Elementary, Kindergarten, and Nursery Educators, 1971.

53. Seefeldt, Carol and others, A Guide for Planning and Operating Home-Based Child Development Programs, Washington, D.C., Office of Child Development (DHEW), June, 1974.

54. Serrano, Tirso G., Project to Improve Equality of Educational Opportunities in Redlands, School Year 1969-70, Title IV Evaluation, Redlands Unified School District, Calif., November, 1970.

55. Shelton, Judith, An Analysis of a Family Involvement - Communication System in a Title I Elementary School, Final Report, Stillwater, Oklahoma State University, July, 1973.

56. Shelton, Judith E. and Russell L. Dobson, "Family-Teacher Involvement: A Counselor's Key," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 8, No. 3 (March 1974), pp. 190-196.

57. Simmons, J. C., "The Importance of Supervisory Visits," Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 44, No. 12 (June, 1972), pp. 313-314.

58. Swayze, Marian C., "Beginning in the Home - A New Dimension in Teacher Education," Viewpoints, Vol. 51, No. 1 (January, 1975), pp. 31-40.

59. Thomas, Susan B. and Janet Bowermaster, The Continuity of Educational Development, Urbana, Ill, ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, October, 1974.

60. Vacanti, Loretta, Parent-Generated Home-School Activities, Washington, D.C., Office of Education (DHEW), 1977.

61. Van Berkum, Clifford, "Seven Kinds of Student Visitations," Agricultural Education, Vol. 48, No. 8 (February, 1976), pp. 188-191.

62. Weeks, Ramona, Attacking Education Problems in Rural Schools, Florence, Ariz., Pinal County Schools, 1972.

63. Weikart, David P., "Has Preschool Compensatory Education Failed?" unpublished paper presented at the 1969 National Head Start Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1969.

64. _____, "Parent Involvement: Process and Results of the High/Scope Foundation's Projects," unpublished paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Denver, Colorado, April 10-13, 1975.

65. White, Burton L. and others, Child Rearing Practices and the Development of Competence, Final Report, Cambridge, Mass., Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, December, 1974.

66. Wirt, Connie, "Communication through Home Visits by Teachers," Journal of Educational Communication, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1977), pp. 10-11.

67. Working with Parents, A Guide for Classroom Teachers and Other Educators, Washington, D.C., Association of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association, 1968.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF DATA

This chapter consists of a detailed description of the procedures followed in the collection and treatment of the data in this study. This chapter is divided into the following four sections: (a) Developing and Validating the Instrument, (b) Pilot Testing the Instrument, (c) Collection of Data, and (d) Treatment of Data.

Developing and Validating the Instrument

This study proposed to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers. In order to identify specific concerns related to home visitations, a panel of experts in the field of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas was organized. Recommendations from Elizabeth Smith, State Director of Homemaking Education, were considered in the selection of the panel. Nineteen persons were contacted during the first week of July, 1978, and agreed to participate in the study as a member of the panel of experts. The panel, which was composed of persons from various geographic areas of the state and various sizes of school districts, represented a wide range of positions, experiences, and interests related to homemaking education. These persons are listed in Table I.

TABLE I

PANEL OF EXPERTS FOR THE HOME VISITATION RESEARCH PROJECT

Caroline Bode Homemaking Teacher President of VHTAT San Antonio, Texas	Sylvia Hinojosa Vocational Administrator Edgewood Public Schools San Antonio, Texas
Virginia Alders Homemaking Teacher Past President of VHTAT Nacogdoches, Texas	Bobbie Moore Area Consultant Texas Education Agency Corpus Christi, Texas
Catherine Payne Homemaking Teacher Board of Directors of VHTAT Friendswood, Texas	Judy Jackson Area Consultant Texas Education Agency Houston, Texas
Bobbie Clay Homemaking Teacher Board of Directors of VHTAT Timpson, Texas	Angie Grace Advisory Council for Vocational Technical Education Austin, Texas
Ann Derrick Vocational Homemaking Supervisor Amarillo Public Schools Amarillo, Texas	Billie Chapman Executive Director VHTAT Austin, Texas
Loretta Clemons Vocational Homemaking Supervisor Dallas Public Schools Dallas, Texas	Jean Barton Consultant Texas Education Agency Austin, Texas
Minerva Ritchie Vocational Homemaking Supervisor Brownsville Public Schools Brownsville, Texas	Wilma Griffin Teacher Educator The University of Texas Austin, Texas
O'Neil Harris Vocational Administrator Arlington Public Schools Arlington, Texas	Camille Bell Teacher Educator Texas Tech University Lubbock, Texas

TABLE I --Continued

Jerry Crossland Vocational Administrator Lewisville Public Schools Lewisville, Texas	Wayne Hendrick Superintendent Plano Public Schools Plano, Texas
Ivan Glasscock Principal Denton High School Denton, Texas	

A letter explaining responsibilities to the study and announcing an orientation session was sent to each panel member following the initial contact. The orientation session was conducted by the investigator on July 24, 1978 at the Dallas Hilton Hotel during the State In-Service Conference for Homemaking Teachers. Fourteen of the panel members attended the orientation meeting. After an overview of the study, its purposes, activities, and time line were presented, the panel members formed small discussion groups. Contributions of home visitations, satisfaction with the current status of home visits, and concerns regarding home visits were discussed. Responses of the groups were recorded and reported. Additionally, the panel members were given a questionnaire containing twelve items to complete and return within two weeks. These responses were used to design the survey instrument to be sent to useful homemaking teachers in the state to identify the perceived status of home visits.

During August, a questionnaire containing thirty-eight content items and ten demographic items was developed. In

September, each panel member received an instrument for the purpose of establishing content validity of the questionnaire. A subjective response regarding the appropriateness and form of each item of the questionnaire was requested. Eighteen of the validation instruments were returned. As a result of the validation process, an instrument containing thirty-five content items and seven demographic items was drafted for the pilot study. Notations required for key punching the responses were added before the questionnaire was printed. This process enabled the survey to go directly to keypunching with little hand coding.

Pilot Testing the Instrument

The questionnaire and procedures were pilot tested in November, 1978. Five school districts (Amarillo, Arlington, Brownsville, Edgewood-San Antonio, and Lewisville) which employ vocational administrators/directors and/or vocational homemaking supervisors were selected. Members of the panel of experts from these districts assisted in the distribution of cover letters, questionnaires, and return envelopes. Panel member Judy Jackson, Area III homemaking consultant, Texas Education Agency, Houston, Texas, provided names and school addresses of teachers in small school districts in Area III where no vocational administrator or supervisor was employed. These districts were selected to achieve a balance of schools of various sizes and various geographic areas of the state. The above steps assured that the procedures followed closely the planned survey.

Seventy-three percent of the useful homemaking teachers returned the questionnaires within a period of two weeks. Many of the teachers shared experiences, ideas, or materials related to home visits in the space provided at the end of the instrument. Teachers receiving the questionnaire were also asked to make suggestions which might improve the clarity and completeness of items. At the suggestion of several teachers from large school districts, a statement concerning busing and students who attend schools outside their own neighborhood was added to item 23 (difficulties related to home visitations). Teachers from San Antonio and Brownsville suggested adding to the list of possible difficulties a statement regarding a language barrier which exists when a language other than English is spoken in the home.

Other changes in the questionnaire were minor. The final form of the questionnaire used in this study was developed from insights given and suggestions received from pilot testing. The results of this pilot study emphasized the usefulness of and need for testing an instrument and procedures before conducting a large survey.

Collection of Data

In January, 1979 the 1978-79 directory of homemaking teachers in Texas was obtained from the Texas Education Agency. Two thousand five hundred and one teachers were identified as teachers of full or combination units of useful homemaking for the 1978-79 school year.

C4

Names and school addresses of vocational administrators and homemaking supervisors were obtained from the 1978-79 directory of the Texas Association of Directors, Supervisors, and Counselors of Vocational-Technical Education. Packets were prepared containing questionnaires, cover letters explaining the purposes of the study, return envelopes, and letters of support from Elizabeth Smith, State Director of Homemaking Education and were mailed to vocational administrators or homemaking supervisors for distribution to teachers in their distract. A letter of transmittal requested the administrator to encourage the teachers to complete and promptly return the questionnaire. Homemaking teachers in districts where no vocational administrator or supervisor was employed were mailed survey materials directly. All teachers were provided an individual stamped return envelope. The survey materials were mailed on February 1, 1979.

The dates questionnaires were returned are shown in Table II. Within eight days, 48.2 percent of those returned had been received. By March 2, a total of 1805 questionnaires had been returned. At this point the data collection was terminated. The collection activities at this point yielded a 72.2 per cent return rate.

TABLE II

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN ANALYSIS BY FREQUENCY AND PER CENT

Date	Return Frequency	Return Cumulative Frequency	Per Cent of Total Return
February 5	122	122	6.8
February 6	345	467	25.9
February 7	129	596	33.0
February 8	136	732	40.6
February 9	138	870	48.2
February 16	468	1338	74.1
February 23	223	1561	86.5
March 2	244	1805	100.0

Treatment of Data

When the questionnaires were returned, each was visually inspected for missing data. Of the questionnaires, 1779 were considered to include an adequate number of responses to be included in the study. Specific responses to "other" on items 27, 31, and 32 were collected, as well as experiences, ideas, or materials related to home visitations which were shared in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire. These specific responses were coded according to community sizes found on the first page of the survey instrument.

After inspection, the data were keypunched and processed by the Computer Center at North Texas State University. In order to answer the 17 research questions, frequency and percent were calculated for each item on the questionnaire. Additionally, the Chi Square Test of Independence was calculated for selected variables to determine whether or not the variables had a relationship. Table III explains how each research question was matched with the appropriate questionnaire item.

TABLE III

RESEARCH QUESTIONS MATCHED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Research Question	Questionnaire Item
1	Demographic items, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 8
2	1, 3
3	13
4	14
5	9
6	21
7	15
8	16
9	17
10	23

TABLE III --Continued

Research Question	Questionnaire Item
11	26, 27, 28
12	22, 25, 32
13	33, 34
14	18, 29, 30, 31
15	24
16	19, 20
17	35

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Borg, Walter R., and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, David McKay Co., Inc., 1971.

2. McCallon, Earl L., Planning and Conducting Surveys, Austin, Texas, Learning Concepts, Inc., 1978.

3. Membership Directory, Texas Association of Directors, Supervisors, and Counselors of Vocational-Technical Education, Austin, Texas, 1978.

4. Nie, Norman H. and others, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1975.

5. Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Second Edition, Dallas, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1975.

6. Vocational Homemaking Teachers, Directory 1978-79, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1978.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS

The results of this investigation, to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers, are presented in this chapter as related to the 17 research questions outlined in Chapter I.

During February, 1979, a total of 2501 questionnaires was mailed to useful homemaking teachers in Texas who were selected for this study. Data collection was terminated on March 2, 1978, with a return rate of 72.2 per cent.

Data were then submitted for keypunching and computer processing at the Computing Center at North Texas State University. From the computer generated statistical analyses, tables reported in this study were constructed. The following is a presentation of that data.

Research Questions Investigated

The 17 research questions presented in Chapter I provided direction for conducting this study. The following narrative will address these 17 research questions in sequential order.

Research question 1 for this study was "Do relationships exist between the percentage of students currently being visited by useful homemaking teachers and variables such as: (a) courses taught, (b) teaching assignment, (c) area of state,

(d) community size, (e) years of teaching experience, (f) degrees earned, (g) preservice training, (h) scheduling of conference period, (i) distance traveled to home visit, (j) funds allocated for travel, and (k) visits made in summer program?" The rationale for this research question related to establishing accountability for home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking programs in Texas. If variables could be identified which related to the quantity of students being visited, then cost effectiveness could be assessed and improved. An analysis of the teachers' responses to item 8 on the questionnaire provided the quantitative variable for research question 1. Item 8 first asked the teachers to write "Approximately how many home visits do you think you will have made by the end of the regular school year?" The second part of item 8, "What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits represent?", provided a four group response pattern: (1) 0-25%, (2) 26-50%, (3) 51-75%, (4) 76-100%. Of the teachers responding to this item, 37.1% reported they would visit 0-25% of their students, 22.6% planned to visit 26-50%, 21.2% reported they would visit 51-75% of their students and 20.1% said they expected to visit 76-100% of their students by the end of the regular school year.

In order to answer research question 1, responses were obtained from the appropriate questionnaire item for each of the listed variables. Demographic items from page 1 of the questionnaire were matched with variables (a) through (g). Variable (h), "scheduling of conference period," was taken from

questionnaire items 1 and 2, variable (i), "distance traveled to home visit," was obtained from item 4, variable (j), "funds allocated for travel," was taken from items 5 and 6, and item 11 provided data for variable (k), "visits made in summer program." For the purpose of this research question, responses were treated as sample data in order to assess the magnitude of possible relationships. A Chi Square Test of Independence was calculated for each of the appropriate items on the questionnaire for the variable "percentage of students visited during the regular school year;" therefore, a series of 23 Chi Square Tests of Independence were calculated for research question 1.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (1) was utilized to calculate the Chi Square Test for Independence. A cross-tabulation table, with one variable serving as the horizontal axis and the second variable serving as the vertical axis of the table, was generated to include marginal totals and per cents and the grand total and per cent response. Below the cross-tabulation table the SPSS generated the Chi Square value, degrees of freedom, and probability level. The interpretation of these data was such that a small value of Chi Square (those having a high probability level of occurrence) was interpreted as the absence of a relationship. Conversely, a large Chi Square (with a small probability level of occurence) indicated a systematic relationship of some sort existed between the two variables under study.

Ten of the 23 Chi Square Tests calculated for research question 1 were for variable (a), "courses taught." The data for these ten tests are presented in Tables XXV through XXXIV in Appendix C. A summary of these Chi Square Tests of Independence for the variable "percentage of students visited during the regular school year" by the elements of courses taught is presented in Table XXXV. The elements for this variable were the ten Vocational (Useful) Homemaking courses presently being offered in public schools in Texas: comprehensive sequential courses in Homemaking I, Homemaking II, Homemaking III, Homemaking IV, and specialized semester or quarter courses in Home and Family Living, Home Furnishings, Home Management, Home Nursing, Child Development, and Consumer Education. All but two of the courses, Home Nursing and Consumer Education, had a Chi Square value large enough to indicate a systematic relationship between the courses and the percentage of students visited at a .05 or less level of significance.

The Chi Square Tests of Independence for variables (b) through (j) are presented in Tables XXXVI through XLVIII in Appendix C. A summary of those variables listed in research question 1 which were found to exhibit a systematic relationship with the variable "percentage of students visited during the regular school year" is presented in Table IV. Nine variables were found to exhibit dependent relationships with the quantitative variable at a .05 or less level of significance.

Research question 2, "When are most home visits typically scheduled?", was addressed by the teachers' responses to

TABLE IV

CHI SQUARE SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE VARIABLE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY SELECTED VARIABLES SIGNIFICANT AT .05 OR LESS LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

Variables	Table Number	X^2	df
Courses Taught			
Homemaking I	XXIV	12.63	3
Homemaking II	XXV	12.53	3
Homemaking III	XXVI	16.40	3
Homemaking IV	XXVII	9.16	3
Home and Family Living	XXVIII	8.39	3
Home Furnishings	XXIX	9.02	3
Home Management	XXX	10.74	3
Child Development	XXXII	10.75	3
Teaching Assignment			
Full or Combination Unit	XXXV	20.60	6
Months of Contract	XXXVI	48.37	9
Area of State	XXXVII	170.86	30
Community Size	XXXVIII	114.20	18
Years of Teaching Experience	XXXIX	52.71	18
Scheduling of Conference Period			
Period for Home Visits	XLII	21.76	6
Visitation Period Adjacent to Conference Period	XLIII	21.83	6
Distance Traveled to Home Visit	XLIV	144.02	15

TABLE IV -- continued

Variables	Table Number	X^2	df
Funds Allocated for Travel Adequacy of Travel Allowance	XLV	26.89	6
Needs for Additional Funds	XLVI	78.00	6
Visits Made in Summer Program	XLVII	83.33	12

questionnaire items 1 and 3. Item 1 stated, "Do you have a period designated for the purpose of home visitations in addition to a conference period?" and "If yes, write which period of the school day is scheduled for home visitations." Reported in Table V are the response patterns to this question. Item 3 asked, "Do you make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visitations?" and "If yes, at what times?" This item had six possible responses: (1) before school, (2) conference period, (3) lunch period, (4) after school, (5) at night, (6) on weekends. Patterns of response for this question are reported in Table VI. From the responses to these items, it was concluded that most teachers (88.2%) have a conference period designated for the purpose of home visitations. Period six (36.5%) was the most frequently scheduled period for visitations with period five (15.6%) designated as the second most frequently reported home visitation period. These findings indicated that teachers scheduled time for home visitations late in the school day. Also, most teachers (89.7%) reported that they make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visits. After school (95.7%), the regular conference period (54.2%), and at night (38.5%) were those times in addition to the period designated for home visitations when visits were typically made.

Research question 3 was "What is the average amount of time spent on a home visit?" This question was addressed by questionnaire item 13 which asked, "What is your estimate of the

TABLE V

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO THE PERIOD SCHEDULED FOR HOME VISITATIONS

Do you have a period designated for the purpose of home visitations in addition to a conference period? If yes, write which period of the school day is scheduled for home visitations.

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Yes	1557	88.2
Period 1	87	5.8
Period 2	124	8.3
Period 3	156	10.4
Period 4	172	11.4
Period 5	234	15.6
Period 6	549	36.5
Period 7	181	12.0
No	208	11.8

Number of Respondents (N = 1765)

TABLE VI

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO HOME VISITATIONS AT TIMES OTHER THAN DESIGNATED VISITATION PERIOD

Do you make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visitations? If yes, at what times? (Please check all that apply.)

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Yes	1575	89.7
Before school	85	5.4
Conference period	853	54.2
Lunch period	389	24.7
After school	1507	95.7
At night	607	38.5
On weekends	468	29.7
No	180	10.3

Number of Respondents (N = 1755)

average time spent on a visit in the home?" Six possible time intervals, ranging from 15 minutes to two hours or more, were given. Table VII provides the responses to this item. The majority of the teachers (56.3%) reported that the average time spent on a home visit was 30 minutes. Only 5.6% reported they spent one hour or one and a half hours, and none of the teachers reported spending two hours or more on a home visit. From the information provided by responses to this item, it was assumed that most teachers could make at least one visit during a designated conference period for home visitations.

Research question 4, "Who is typically present when the home is visited?" was evaluated by the teachers' responses to item 14 on the questionnaire. This item gave the teachers an opportunity to check from a list of six individuals those who were typically present when the home was visited. These persons included (1) mother, (2) father, (3) guardian, (4) student, (5) other family member, (6) spouse of student. The response to this question as found in Table VIII was that the mother (95.1%) was most often present for the visit, with the student present 59.0% of the time. Fathers were usually not present for the visit, as indicated by the low response (10.3%) to that variable. In addition to mothers and students, other family members (33.4%), probably younger children, were frequently present when the home was visited.

"Is the same home visited more than once during the school year?" was research question 5. Item 9, "Do you visit the same home more than once during the regular school year?",

TABLE VII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO THE TIME SPENT ON HOME VISITATIONS

What is your estimate of the average time spent on a visit in the home?

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
15 minutes	362	20.9
30 minutes	975	56.3
45 minutes	296	17.1
One hour	92	5.3
1 1/2 hours	6	0.3
Two hours or more	0	0.0

Number of Respondents (N = 1731)

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PERSONS WHO ARE PRESENT WHEN THE HOME IS VISITED

Please check all persons who are typically present when the home is visited.

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Mother	1692	95.1
Father	184	10.3
Guardian	211	11.9
Student	1050	59.0
Other family member	595	33.4
Spouse of student	76	4.3

Number of Respondents (N = 1779)

addressed question 5 and offered a four-point continuum response pattern. The responses were (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) usually, (4) always. Table IX contains the teachers' responses to this item. Of the homemaking teachers, 62.8% reported that they seldom visit the same home more than once during the regular school year, while 23.3% said they usually repeat visits. In reducing the response continuum to a dichotomy, it was concluded that the majority of the teachers (75.1%) seldom or never visited the same home more than once during the regular school year.

Research question 6, "What are the purposes and contributions of home visits as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?" was addressed by the teachers' responses to questionnaire item 21. Item 21 stated "How do home visits contribute to your total Vocational Homemaking program? (Please check all that apply) and write the number of the item listed above that you would consider the main purpose of the visits." A list of 12 contributions was provided for the teachers' responses. Tables X and XI present the response patterns for this item. Seven of the twelve responses were checked by over 50% of the teachers as ways in which home visits contribute to their total Vocational Homemaking program. These were: (1) "aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interests of students," (57.7%), (3) "gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the Homemaking program," (62.4%), (5) "increases student self-concept and improves student and teacher

TABLE IX

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO WHETHER THE SAME HOME IS VISITED MORE THAN ONCE

Do you visit the same home more than once during the regular school year?

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Always	27	1.6
Usually	403	23.3
Seldom	1089	62.8
Never	214	12.3

Number of Respondents (N = 1733)

TABLE X

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO CONTRIBUTIONS OF HOME VISITATIONS

How do home visits contribute to your total Vocational Homemaking program? (Please check all that apply.)

	Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
1.	Aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interests of students	1027	57.7
2.	Aids in planning for relevant classroom activities and in developing and revising curriculum	725	40.8
3.	Gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the Homemaking program	1110	62.4
4.	Identifies needs for adult work and YHT	532	29.9
5.	Increases student self concept and improves student and teacher relationships	1142	64.2
6.	Increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors	1238	69.6
7.	Increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment	1570	88.3
8.	Promotes understanding of FHA as an integral part of Vocational Homemaking programs	551	31.0

TABLE X --Continued

How do home visits contribute to your total Vocational Homemaking program? (Please check all that apply.)

	Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
9.	Provides better understanding of the community and its resources	882	49.6
10.	Provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience	1256	70.6
11.	Provides opportunity to promote regular and summer programs and encourage future enrollment and planning	810	45.5
12.	Provides students and parents with information regarding Vocational courses and careers	959	53.9

Number of Respondents
(N = 1779)

TABLE XI

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION AND RANKINGS OF RESPONSES TO MAIN PURPOSE OF HOME VISITATIONS

Write the number of the item listed above that you would consider the main purpose of home visits.

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Rank
1. Aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interests of students	138	9.2	4
2. Aids in planning for relevant classroom activities and in developing and revising curriculum	66	4.4	7
3. Gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the Homemaking program	98	6.5	5
4. Identifies needs for adult work and YHT	14	1.0	12
5. Increases student self concept and improves student and teacher relationships	239	15.8	3
6. Increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors	67	4.4	6
7. Increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment	480	31.8	1

TABLE XI --Continued

Write the number of the item listed above that you would consider the main purpose of home visits.

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Rank
8. Promotes understanding of FHA as an integral part of Vocational Homemaking programs	15	1.0	11
9. Provides better understanding of the community and its resources	19	1.3	10
10. Provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience	294	19.5	2
11. Provides opportunity to promote regular and summer programs and encourage future enrollment and planning	20	1.3	9
12. Provides students and parents with information regarding Vocational courses and careers	54	3.6	8

Number of Respondents (N = 1508)

relationships," (64.2%), (6) "increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors," (69.6%), (7) "increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment," (88.3%), (10) "provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," (70.6%), and (12) "provides students and parents with information regarding Vocational courses and careers," (53.9%). There was no agreement of the majority of the teachers regarding the main purpose of home visitations. The two contributions which received the greatest percentage of responses as the main purpose of home visits were "7. increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment," (31.8%), and "10. provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," (19.5%). The responses to this item indicated that although the teachers felt home visits contributed to the homemaking program in a variety of ways, there was not an identified main purpose of home visitations.

"How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) are home visits to the total vocational homemaking program?" was research question 7 for this study. Item 15 of the questionnaire provided data for evaluation of question 7. A four-point continuum response patters was offered for the question "How important do you believe home visitations are to the total Vocational Homemaking program at your school?" The data for this question are presented in Table XII. Of the teachers responding to this item, 15.4% said home visitations were "very important" and 23.1% answered "definitely important." The

TABLE XII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF HOME VISITATIONS

How important do you believe home visitations are to the total Vocational Homemaking program at your school?

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Very important	272	15.4
Definitely important	409	23.1
Somewhat important	774	43.7
Unimportant	316	17.8

Number of Respondents
(N= 1771)

largest percentage of the teachers, 43.7%, indicated that home visitations were only "somewhat important" to the total vocational homemaking program at their school, and 17.8% said home visits were "unimportant." When these responses were reduced to a dichotomy, it was determined that a majority, 61.5%, of the teachers believed that home visitations were only "somewhat important" or were "unimportant."

Research question 8, "How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) do school administrators consider home visits to be to the total Vocational Homemaking program?" was closely related to research question 7. Item 16 of the questionnaire provided data for evaluation of question 8 and offered a four-point continuum response pattern. The responses were (1) unimportant, (2) somewhat important, (3) definitely important, (4) very important. Table XIII presents data related to this question. Of the homemaking teachers, 50.1% perceived that school administrators consider home visits as only "somewhat important" and 21.6% perceived that school administrators consider home visits to be "unimportant" to the total Vocational Homemaking program at their school. The response "very important" was selected by 10.3% of the homemaking teachers, and 18.1% selected "definitely important." When these responses were reduced to a dichotomy, it was concluded that a majority of the homemaking teachers, 71.7%, perceived that school administrators considered home visitations as "somewhat important" or "unimportant" to the total Vocational Homemaking program at their school.

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS' OPINIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF HOME VISITATIONS

How important do you believe administrators (principals, vocational directors, superintendents, etc.) consider home visitations are to the total Vocational Homemaking program at your school?

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Very important	181	10.3
Definitely important	317	18.1
Somewhat important	879	50.1
Unimportant	379	21.6
Number of Respondents (N= 1756)		

Research question 9 was "To what extent do the following individuals enccurage useful homemaking teachers to do home visitations: (a) teacher educators, (b) other homemaking teachers, (c) homemaking department chairperson, (d) homemaking city supervisor, (e) vocational administrator/director, (f) area homemaking consultant, (g) school principal, (h) superintendent/assistant superintendent?" Item 17 on the questionnaire asked the teachers to indicate the degree of encouragement they had received to do home visits from each of the previously listed individuals. Responses were given on a four-point continuum. If no such position existed the teacher was instructed to mark "not applicable." Table XIV presents the teachers' responses to this item. From the responses given to this item, it was concluded that two individuals provided extensive encouragement to the teachers to do home visitations. These were homemaking city supervisors (56.3%) and area homemaking consultants (52.7%). When the responses were reduced to a dichotomy including "some" and "extensive" encouragement, six of the persons were identified by over 50% of the teachers as providing encouragement. This procedure added teacher educators (79.3%), homemaking department chairpersons (66.8%), vocational administrators/directors (58.8%), and other homemaking teachers (53.8%) to area homemaking consultants (85.3%) and homemaking city supervisors (79.9%). At the opposite end of the continuum, superintendents/assistant superintendents were identified as providing "no encouragement" to do home visitations by 48.7% of the

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO ENCOURAGEMENT RECEIVED TO CONDUCT HOME VISITS FROM SELECTED INDIVIDUALS

Indicate the degree of encouragement you have received to do home visits from each of these individuals. (Please circle appropriate number. If no such position exists in your school, mark Not Applicable).

Variable	Not Applicable		No Encouragement		Very Little Encouragement		Some Encouragement		Extensive Encouragement		Number of Respondents
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Home Economics Teacher Educator	1034	58.1	72	9.7	82	11.0	238	31.9	353	47.4	N = 745
Other Homemaking Teachers	359	20.2	333	23.5	322	22.7	567	39.9	198	13.9	N = 1420
Homemaking Department Chairperson	949	53.3	145	17.5	130	15.7	305	36.7	250	30.1	N = 830
Homemaking City Supervisor	1351	75.9	48	11.2	38	8.9	101	23.6	241	56.3	N = 428
Vocational Administrator/Director	733	41.2	251	24.0	180	17.2	321	30.7	294	28.1	N = 1046
Area Homemaking Consultant	122	6.9	88	9.3	154	9.3	541	32.6	874	52.7	N = 1657
School Principal	132	7.4	706	42.9	323	19.6	456	27.7	162	9.8	N = 1647
Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent	246	13.8	746	48.7	278	18.1	349	22.8	160	10.4	N = 1533

homemaking teachers. Teachers (42.9%) said school principals likewise provide no encouragement to do home visitations. From these responses it can be concluded that homemaking teachers receive encouragement to visit students' homes from a variety of individuals. The contribution of the area homemaking consultant in motivating teachers to have effective homemaking programs was supported by the responses to this item. Since not all school districts have the benefit of a homemaking city supervisor, the importance of the role of the area consultant, although physically removed from the school setting, was established.

"What difficulties do useful homemaking teachers encounter in making home visitations?" was research question 10 for this study. Item 23 on the questionnaire asked "What difficulties do you have related to home visitations? (Please check all that apply.)" A list of nine difficulties was provided for the homemaking teachers' consideration. The frequency and per cent distribution and rankings of their responses to this item are presented in Table XV. The greatest response of the teachers related to difficulties in scheduling home visitations. "Parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours" was selected by 93.0% of the teachers and "an invitation to visit the home is not extended" ranked second, being selected by 80.2% of the teachers. The difficulty which ranked third was "parents and students misinterpret the purpose of home visits" with 55.3% of the responses. "Majority of the period for home visits is used for other duties and activities

TABLE XV

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION AND RANKINGS OF RESPONSES TO DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO HOME VISITATIONS

What difficulties do you have related to home visitations? (Please check all that apply.)

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Rank
A barrier exists between parents and teachers when a language other than English is spoken in the home	520	29.2	6
An invitation to visit the home is not extended	1427	80.2	2
Because of busing, some students attend a school outside their own neighborhood	259	14.6	9
Distance to home visit is too far to travel and return during one period	645	36.3	5
Majority of the period for home visits is used for other duties and activities related to the homemaking or school programs	937	52.7	4
Parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours	1655	93.0	1
Parents and students misinterpret the purpose of home visits	984	55.3	3

TABLE XV --Continued

What difficulties do you have related to home visitations? (Please check all that apply.)

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Rank
Some homes are located in areas that are considered to be unsafe to travel in alone	467	26.2	7
Visiting with male students or father only is questionable	385	21.6	8

Number of Respondents
(N = 1779)

related to the homemaking or school programs" ranked fourth with 52.7% of the responses. All other difficulties received less than 50% of the responses. "Because of busing, some students attend a school outside their own neighborhood" was identified as a difficulty by 14.6% of the homemaking teachers. From the teachers' responses to this item it was concluded that a variety of difficulties are encountered in attempting to conduct home visitations; however, the greatest difficulties are related to scheduling home visitations.

"To what extent do useful homemaking teachers use the information gained on the home visit?" was research question 11. This research question is addressed by the questionnaire items 26, 27, and 28, and is presented in Table XVI. Item 26, "Do you share information gained on the home visit with other school personnel?", offered a four-point continuum response pattern. The responses were (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) usually, (4) always. Of the homemaking teachers responding to this item, 39.2% reported that they seldom shared information gained on the home visit with other school personnel, while 46.8% said they usually shared information. Only 5.4% said they never shared information gained on home visitations. In reducing the response continuum to a dichotomy, it was concluded that over half (55.4%) of the teachers shared information with other school personnel.

Item 27 asked "With which other school personnel might you share information obtained on the home visit? (Please check all that apply.)" This item gave the teachers an opportunity to

TABLE XVI

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO USE OF INFORMATION GAINED IN HOME VISITATIONS

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Number of Respondents
Question: Do you share information gained on the home visit with other school personnel?			
Always	149	8.6	
Usually	815	46.8	
Seldom	682	39.2	
Never	94	5.4	N= 1740
Question: With which other school personnel might you share information obtained on the home visit? (Please check all that apply.)			
Area homemaking consultant	334	18.8	
Counselors	1250	70.3	
Homemaking supervisor or Vocational Administrator	366	20.6	
Other homemaking teachers	1293	72.7	
Other teachers in building	746	41.9	
Other Vocational teachers	298	16.8	

TABLE XVI --Continued

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Number of Respondents
Question: With which other school personnel might you share information obtained on the home visit? (Please check all that apply.)			
Principal or assistant Principal	1050	59.0	
School nurse	672	37.8	
Other	66	3.7	N = 1779
Question: Do you have a method of recording specific information gained on the home visit other than the existing vocational home-making reports?			
Yes	450	25.7	
No	1302	74.3	N = 1752

select from a list of eight individuals those with whom they might share information. These personnel included (1) area homemaking consultant, (2) counselors, (3) homemaking supervisor or vocational administrator, (4) other homemaking teachers, (5) other teachers in building, (6) other vocational teachers, (7) principal or assistant principal, (8) school nurse, and (9) other. From the teachers' responses, it was found that other homemaking teachers (72.7%), counselors (70.3%), and principal or assistant principal (59.0%) were the individuals with whom homemaking teachers shared information. It was of interest that the individuals who were reported to provide the greatest degree of encouragement to conduct home visits were not the same individuals with whom information gained on visitations was shared. Area homemaking consultants were selected by 18.8% and homemaking supervisors or vocational administrators were selected by 20.6% of the teachers.

"Do you have a method of recording specific information gained on the home visit other than the existing vocational homemaking reports?" was item 28. The majority (74.3%) of the teachers responding to this question answered negatively. This response was not unusual since 44.6% of the teachers seldom or never shared information gained on the home visitations.

Research question 12, "What alternative methods of contacting the home are being used by useful homemaking teachers?" is addressed in Table XVII which contains the teachers' responses to items 22, 25, and 32 on the questionnaire. Item 25 asked, "Would you be willing to make home visits if requested

TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO ALTERNATIVE METHODS OF CONTACTING HOMES

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Number of Respondents
Question: Would you be willing to make home visits if requested by students and parents, if no period were provided for making home visits?			
Yes	1206	69.0	
No	542	31.0	N = 1748
Question: In what ways other than home visits do you contact parents or the home? (Please check all that apply.)			
Contacts in the community	1454	81.7	
Drive through neighborhood	513	28.8	
FHA activities	1390	78.1	
Homemaking department activities	1286	72.3	
Parents serve as resource person	960	54.0	
PTA meetings	652	36.6	
Telephone conversation	1471	82.7	

TABLE XVII-Continued

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Number of Respondents
Question: In what ways other than home visits do you contact parents or the home? (Please check all that apply.)			
Visit at parent's place of employment	750	42.2	
Written correspondence	663	37.3	
Other school activities or events	1445	81.2	N = 1779
Question: What methods do you use to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience?			
Class displays of individual work	740	41.6	
Class progress reports	903	50.8	
Home visit	958	53.9	
Individual student conference at school	798	44.9	
Telephone conversation	382	21.5	
Written evaluation from parents	1102	61.9	
Written evaluation from students	1476	83.0	
Other	43	2.4	N = 1779

by students and parents, if no period were provided for making home visits?" Of the teachers responding to this item, 69.0% said "yes." This response indicated that teachers believe home visitations are an effective method of contacting homes.

Item 22, "In what ways other than home visits do you contact parents or the home? (Please check all that apply.)", gave the teachers an opportunity to select from a list of ten methods those that they used. These methods included (1) contacts in the community, (2) drive through neighborhood, (3) FHA activities, (4) homemaking department activities, (5) parents serve as resource person, (6) PTA meetings, (7) telephone conversations, (8) visit at parent's place of employment, (9) written correspondence, and (10) other school activities or events. Six of the ten methods were checked by over 50% of the teachers as methods other than home visitations of contacting parents or the home. These were: "contacts in the community," (81.4%), "other school activities or events," (81.2%), "telephone conversation," (82.7%), "FHA activities," (78.1%), "homemaking department activities," (72.3%), and "parents serve as resource person," (54.0%). All ten of the methods listed in this item were employed by at least 20 per cent of the teachers. "Drive through neighborhood," (28.8%) received the lowest frequency of responses. Responses to this item indicate that useful homemaking teachers employ a variety of methods to contact parents or the home other than home visitations.

Since supervision and evaluation of the home experience/extended learning experience is the identified purpose of home visitations, item 32 asked "What methods do you use to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience?" Seven specific methods, including "home visit," were provided as choices for the teachers' responses. The largest percentage of teachers reported "written evaluation from students," (83.0%) as the method used most frequently. Two other methods were also selected by over 50% of the home-making teachers. These were "written evaluation from parents," (61.9%) and "class progress reports," (50.8%). Over half, 53.9%, of the teachers reported that they use "home visits" to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience. "Telephone conversation," which was reported in item 22 to be a major method of contacting parents or the home (82.7%), was the least frequently reported method used to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience (21.5%).

Research question 13 for this study was "How important are home experiences/extended learning experiences to the total vocational homemaking program as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?" Responses to questionnaire items 33 and 34 were evaluated for this research question. Questionnaire item 34 "How important do you believe home experiences/extended learning experiences are to your homemaking program?" offered a four-point continuum response pattern as follows: (1) unimportant,

(2) somewhat important, (3) definitely important, (4) very important. Responses to this question are presented in Table XVIII. Of the teachers responding to this item, the largest percentage (43.0%) indicated that they believed that home experiences are only "somewhat important" to the homemaking program and 24.2% said home experiences are "definitely important." When these responses were reduced to a dichotomy, a majority, 57.8% of the homemaking teachers believed home experiences/extended learning experiences are only "somewhat important" or "unimportant" to their homemaking program.

The teachers' responses to item 33 on the questionnaire presented in Table XIX also indicated their beliefs about the importance of home experiences/extended learning experiences, since decisions regarding credit for courses and completion of home experiences are made by individual teachers and schools, rather than the Texas Education Agency. When asked "In your class, can students receive credit for a useful homemaking course if they do not complete a home experience/extended learning experience?", 60.6% of the teachers responded negatively. This response indicated that a high degree of importance was placed on home experiences by over half of the teachers responding.

Research question 14, "Are additional resource materials and methods needed to assist useful homemaking teachers in making home visits?" was evaluated by the teachers' responses to four items on the questionnaire, 18, 29, 30, and 31. Tables XX and XXI provide the responses to these items. In addition

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF HOME EXPERIENCES/ EXTENDED LEARNING EXPERIENCES

How important do you believe home experiences/ extended learning experiences are to your homemaking program?

Variable	Frequency	Per cent
Very important	318	17.9
Definitely important	429	24.2
Somewhat important	763	43.0
Unimportant	263	14.8
Number of Respondents (N= 1773)		

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO CREDIT RECEIVED FOR A COURSE WHEN NO HOME EXPERIENCE IS COMPLETED

In your class, can students receive credit for a useful homemaking course if they do not complete a home experience/extended learning experience?

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Yes	689	39.4
No	1061	60.6
Number of Respondents (N= 1750)		

TABLE XX

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PREPARATION TO CONDUCT HOME VISITATIONS

Rate the adequacy with which your teacher education program prepared you to make home visits.

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Very well prepared	214	12.1
Well prepared	410	23.1
Somewhat prepared	652	36.8
Inadequately prepared	497	28.0
Number of Respondents (N = 1773)		

TABLE XXI

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO NEEDS REGARDING HOME VISITATIONS

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Number of Respondents
Question: Would an inservice workshop to develop skills and competencies for effective home visitations be helpful to you?			
Yes	894	51.0	
No	860	49.0	N = 1754
Question: Would a teacher handbook for planning and preparing for effective home visitations be helpful to you?			
Yes	1076	61.3	
No	680	38.7	N = 1756
Question: If an inservice workshop or a handbook were planned related to home visitations, which topics would be most helpful to you? (Please check all that apply.)			
Be alert to serious problems	407	23.0	

TABLE XXI -- continued

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Number of Respondents
Question: If an inservice workshop or a handbook were planned related to home visitations, which topics would be most helpful to you? (Please check all that apply.)			
Deciding on Goals/Objectives/Strategies	479	26.9	
Do's and Don'ts	782	44.0	
Helping parents understand the program	988	55.5	
Ice breakers--Greetings	544	30.6	
Importance of a confident frame of mind	193	10.8	
Learning the neighborhood	136	7.6	
Making notes--Keeping records	582	32.7	
Materials to take	415	23.3	
Ready answers when parents ask	514	28.9	
Scheduling home visits	724	40.7	
Sharing information obtained	253	14.2	
Supervising and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience	796	44.7	
Other	76	4.3	N = 1779

to assessing specific needs related to conducting home visits, item 18 asked the teachers to "rate the adequacy with which your teacher education program prepared you to make home visits." A four-point continuum response pattern, (1) inadequately prepared, (2) somewhat prepared, (3) well prepared, or (4) very well prepared, was provided. Of the teachers responding to this item 36.8% said they were somewhat prepared and 28.0% said they were inadequately prepared. Only 12.1% rated the adequacy of their teacher education program as very well prepared. In reducing the response continuum to a dichotomy, it was concluded that the majority of the teachers (64.8%) rated their preservice education to do home visits as less than well prepared.

Item 29 asked, "Would an inservice workshop to develop skills and competencies for effective home visitations be helpful to you?", and item 30 asked, "Would a teacher handbook for planning and preparing for effective home visitations be helpful to you?" A teacher handbook was favored by 61.3% of the homemaking teachers, while only 51.0% said that an inservice workshop for effective home visitations would be helpful. When the teachers were asked to select those topics which would be most helpful if an inservice workshop or handbook were planned related to home visitations, one of the 13 topics was selected by a majority of the teachers, "helping parents understand the program," (55.5%). Three topics were identified as needs by over 40 percent of the homemaking

teachers. These were: "scheduling home visits," (40.7%), "do's and don'ts," (44.0%), and "supervising and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," (44.7%). These responses are consistent with the teachers' responses related to difficulties in making home visitations (research question 8) and purposes and contributions of home visitations (research question 4). "Parents and students misinterpret the purpose of home visits" ranked third as a difficulty related to home visitations. However, difficulties related to scheduling home visits, "an invitation to visit the home is not extended" and "parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours" which ranked high on item 23, were not identified as a need in item 31. "Provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," which ranked second as the main purpose of home visitations in item 21, was also identified as a topic to be included in a handbook or inservice workshop for homemaking teachers.

"Are useful homemaking teachers satisfied with the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education?" was research question 15. On item 24 teachers were asked, "Rate your degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of your homemaking program." Responses to the four-point continuum, (1) not satisfied, (2) somewhat satisfied, (3) definitely satisfied, and (4) very satisfied, are presented in Table XXI. Of the teachers responding to

TABLE XXII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION WITH STATUS OF HOME VISITATIONS

Rate your degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of your homemaking program.

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Very satisfied	318	17.9
Definitely satisfied	429	24.2
Somewhat satisfied	763	43.0
Not satisfied	263	14.8

Number of Respondents (N = 1773)

this item, 42.7% indicated they were "somewhat satisfied" and 31.2% were "not satisfied." Together these responses represented 73.9% of the teachers. Only 9.2% of the homemaking teachers rated their degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of your homemaking program as "very satisfied."

Finally, research questions 16 and 17 addressed recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home visitations and home experiences/extended learning experiences. Items 19 and 20 on the questionnaire were utilized to evaluate question 16, "What are recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home visitations?" and responses are presented in Table XXIII. Item 19, "Home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas" offered a four-point continuum response pattern as follows: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, and (4) strongly agree. The percentage of teachers that agreed with the statement was 40.7%, whereas 24.8% disagreed. As a dichotomy, a majority, 61.3%, agreed or strongly agreed that home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Item 20 asked, "How effective do you believe the Vocational Homemaking program would be without home visits?" and presented these five possible responses: "would make no difference," "ineffective," "somewhat effective," "definitely effective," and "very effective." Collectively, 46.9% of the teachers said the homemaking program would be "definitely effective" (32.8%), or

TABLE XXIII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING HOME VISITATIONS

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent	Number of Respondents
Question: Home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.			
Strongly agree	363	20.6	
Agree	716	40.7	
Disagree	437	24.8	
Strongly disagree	244	13.9	N= 1760
Question: How effective do you believe the Vocational Homemaking program would be without home visits?			
Very effective	270	15.2	
Definitely effective	564	31.7	
Somewhat effective	526	29.6	
Ineffective	135	7.6	
Would make no difference	284	16.0	N= 1779

"very effective" (17.0%), without home visits. Only 7.6% indicated that programs would be "ineffective" without home visits and 16.0% said it "would make no difference" without home visits in vocational homemaking programs.

Research question 17 for this study was "What are recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home experiences/extended learning experiences?" Item 35 on the questionnaire was utilized to evaluate research question 17 and responses are presented in Table XXIV. Questionnaire item 35, "Home experiences should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas," provided four possible responses: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, and (4) strongly agree. The largest percentage of the teachers (44.0%) responding to this item agreed that home experiences should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Collectively, 64.9% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed to continue home experiences. Only 11.2% strongly disagreed with the statement.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Nie, Norman H. and others, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1975.

2. Roscoe, John L., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Second Edition, Dallas, Holt Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1975.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A survey of useful homemaking teachers in the state of Texas was conducted to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education. During February, 1979, every useful homemaking teacher (2501) was mailed questionnaires which addressed specific concerns related to home visitations. Seventeen research questions provided the framework for development of the survey instrument. The first question evaluated variables which might be related to the percentage of students visited during the regular school year. Other research questions were concerned with qualitative aspects of home visitation as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. The collected data were keypunched and processed at North Texas State University's Computing Center. Data generated included frequencies, percents, and appropriate Chi Square Tests of Independence.

Seventeen conclusions were reached in this study. They were the direct products of the research questions employed in providing direction for this study.

Answering research question number 1, "Do relationships exist between the percentage of students currently being visited by useful homemaking teachers and variables such as: (a) courses taught, (b) teaching assignments, (c) area of state, (d) community size, (e) years of teaching experience.

(f) degrees earned, (g) preservice training, (h) scheduling of conference period, (i) distance traveled to home visit, (j) funds allocated for travel, and (k) visits made in summer program?", it was concluded that nine variables exhibited dependent relationships with the variable "percentage of students visited during the regular school year" at a .05 or less level of significance. These variables were courses taught (all courses except Home Nursing and Consumer Education), teaching assignment, area of state, community size, years of teaching experience, scheduling of conference period, distance traveled to home visit, funds allocated for travel, and visits made in summer program.

In response to research question 2, "When are most home visits typically scheduled?" it was concluded that most teachers have a conference period designated for the purpose of home visitations and that period six was the most frequently scheduled period for visitations with period five designated as the second most frequently reported home visitation period. Also, most teachers reported that they make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visits. After school, the regular conference period, and at night were those times in addition to the period designated for home visitations when visits were typically made.

From research question 3, "What is the average amount of time spent on a home visit?", it was concluded that the majority of the teachers spend an average of 30 minutes on

a home visit. Only a few of the teachers spent one hour or one and a half hours, and none of the teachers reported spending two hours or more on a home visit.

A fourth conclusion was reached as to who is typically present when the home is visited (question 4). Teachers reported that the mother was most often present for the visit and fathers were usually not present. Students and other family members were frequently present when the home was visited. Additionally, it was concluded that the majority of the teachers seldom or never visited the same home more than once during the regular school year (question 5).

A sixth conclusion was reached regarding the purposes and contributions of home visits as perceived by useful homemaking teachers (question 6). Seven responses were selected by a majority of the teachers as ways in which home visits contribute to their total Vocational Homemaking program. These were (1) "aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interest of students," (2) "gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the Homemaking program," (3) "increases student self-concept and improves student and teacher relationships," (4) "increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors," (5) "increases understanding and knowledge of students' home environment," (6) "provides opportunity to assist in planning, and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," and (7) "provides students and parents with the information

regarding vocational courses and careers." There was no agreement by a majority of the teachers regarding the "main" purpose of home visitations.

Answering research question 7, "How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) are home visits to the total Vocational Homemaking program?" it was concluded that a majority of the teachers believed that home visitations were only "somewhat important" or "unimportant."

In response to research question 8, "How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) do school administrators consider home visits to be to the total Vocational Homemaking program?", it was concluded that a majority of the homemaking teachers perceived that school administrators considered home visitations as "somewhat important" or "unimportant" to the total Vocational Homemaking program at their school.

Another conclusion reached had to do with the degree of encouragement useful homemaking teachers received to conduct home visits from selected individual (research question 9). It was determined that two individuals (homemaking city supervisors and area homemaking consultants) provided "extensive" encouragement to a majority of the teachers to conduct home visitations. Four more individuals were identified by over half of the teachers as providing "some" or "extensive" encouragement. These included teacher educators, homemaking department chairpersons, vocational administrators, and other homemaking

teachers. At the opposite end of the continuum, it was concluded that superintendents/assistant superintendents and school principals provided "very little or no" encouragement to the homemaking teachers to do home visitations.

Conclusion ten was that teachers encounter a variety of difficulties in attempting to conduct home visitations; however, the greatest difficulties are related to scheduling home visitations (research question 10). "Parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours" and "an invitation to visit the home is not extended" were the major difficulties identified by the teachers.

The next conclusion related to research question 11, "To what extent do useful homemaking teachers use the information gained on the home visit?" It was concluded that over half of the teachers shared information with other school personnel. Other homemaking teachers, counselors, and principals or assistant principals were the individuals with whom homemaking teachers might share information. Additionally, it was determined that a majority of the teachers do not have a method of recording specific information gained on the home visit other than the existing vocational homemaking reports.

Another conclusion reached related to alternative methods of contacting the home that are being used by useful homemaking teachers (question 12). A majority of the teachers indicated that they would be willing to make home visits if requested by students and parents, even if no period were provided for

making home visits. Six methods other than home visits were identified by over half of the teachers as methods of contacting parents or the home. These were (1) "contacts in the community," (2) "other school activities or events," (3) "telephone conversations," (4) "FHA (Future Homemakers of America) activities," (5) "homemaking department activities," and (6) "parents serve as resource person." From these responses it was concluded that useful homemaking teachers employ a variety of methods to contact parents or the home other than home visitations. Additionally, a variety of methods in addition to home visitations are utilized to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience. Written evaluations from students and parents, and class progress reports were the primary methods reported.

Answering research question 13, "How important are home experiences/extended learning experiences to the total Vocational Homemaking program as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?", it was concluded that a majority of the homemaking teachers believe home experiences/extended learning experiences are only "somewhat important" or "unimportant" to their homemaking program. Responses regarding credit received for course work if no home experience/extended learning experience is completed indicated that a high degree of importance was placed on home experiences by over half of the teachers.

Conclusion 14 was that the majority of teachers rated their preservice education to do home visits as less than well

prepared. Over half of the teachers indicated that a teacher handbook for planning and preparing for effective home visitation would be helpful. A handbook was favored by a larger percentage of teachers than an inservice workshop related to home visitations. No strong agreement regarding topics to be included in a handbook or workshop was found to exist. The topics that were most requested were somewhat consistent with the previously identified difficulties related to home visitations and the purposes and contributions of home visitations. Conclusion 15 was that a majority of useful homemaking teachers are only "somewhat satisfied" or "not satisfied" with the current status of home visitations as a part of their homemaking program (research question 15).

Conclusions 16 and 17 were related to recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home visitations and home experiences/extended learning experiences. A majority of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Conversely, a large percentage of teachers said the homemaking program would be "definitely effective" or "very effective" without home visits. Regarding home experiences/extended learning experiences, it was concluded that a majority of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed to continue home experiences.

A major implication from these conclusions regarding the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers

is that changes are needed. Useful homemaking teachers believe that home visitations should continue to be a part of homemaking programs, although they are not satisfied with the current status of home visits. The teachers did not perceive home visits as they now exist to be important to the total Homemaking program and believed the program would be effective without home visits. Nevertheless, a majority of the homemaking teachers indicated that they would make home visits even if no conference period were provided for the purpose of visits and that they currently make home visits at times other than the designated visitation period. Approximately 37 percent of the teachers reported they expected to visit only 25 percent or less of their students by the end of the school year. Scheduling home visits was identified as the major difficulty by a very high percentage of the homemaking teachers.

The following are recommendations which are implicit from the findings of this study:

1. If information gained on the home visit is to be useful and shared with other school personnel, then a method for recording information should be developed. This could be accomplished by the individual teacher or teachers within a department in order to meet the needs of individual schools.
2. A teacher handbook addressing the specific topics identified as needs for planning and conducting effective home visitations should be developed.

3. Preparation for conducting home visitations should be included as a major component of the homemaking teachers' pre-service education program.

4. The purpose of home visitations as stated in the Vocational Homemaking Education Program Standards should be expanded to include more than the supervision of home experiences/extended learning experiences. Further, these purposes and contributions of home visitations should be communicated to parents and students.

5. Homemaking teachers should be encouraged by persons in supervisory or administrative positions to make home visits and when home visits cannot be made, other methods of contacting the home should be employed.

6. Homemaking teachers should record all contacts with the home, whether through a home visit or other method. Contacting the home of every student enrolled in a useful homemaking course should be the teacher's goal.

The following are recommendations for additional studies related to home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

1. A study to determine the cost effectiveness of home visitations should be conducted because of the low percentage of students visited as reported in this study.

2. A similar study to identify perceptions of useful homemaking students and their parents related to home visitations should be conducted.

3. A similar study to identify perceptions of school administrators and teacher educators related to home visitations should be conducted.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER, SUPPORT LETTER, AND LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL ACCOMPANYING RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Educational Personnel Development Consortium for Northeast Texas

education service centers
REGIONS VII, VIII, X, XI
the plus in education

DR. BILLY N. POPE
DIRECTOR
P. O. BOX 1300
400 EAST SPRING VALLEY
RICHARDSON, TEXAS 75080
(AC 214) 231-6301

TO THE VOCATIONAL ADMINISTRATOR OR SUPERVISOR ADDRESSED:

A project is currently being funded by the Texas Education Agency to identify the current status of home visitations as a part of vocational homemaking education in Texas. A panel of experts including useful homemaking teachers, homemaking supervisors, home economics teacher educators, school administrators, Texas Education Agency area and state staff members, and representatives of the Advisory Council for Vocational Technical Education and the Vocational Homemaking Teachers Association of Texas have been involved in the development and validation of the survey instrument. A pilot test was conducted in the fall with approximately 75 percent of the sample responding. Your help is needed with the next step of this research project--the statewide survey of all useful homemaking teachers and combination useful/gainful teachers.

Enclosed you will find cover letters, support letters from Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, questionnaires, and return envelopes. Please distribute these materials within the next few days to each of the respective teachers in your district. It will not be necessary for you to collect and return the questionnaires since each teacher will mail the questionnaire directly to me.

I would appreciate any support you might lend to the project by encouraging the teachers to complete and promptly return the questionnaires. Please feel free to contact me by phone (214-231-6301) or mail if you have any questions. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Brenda Mitchell

Brenda S. Mitchell
Principal Investigator
Home Visitation Project

BSM:ns
Enclosures

cc: Mr. Hayden McDaniel
Mrs. Elizabeth Smith

PARTICIPATING EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS

REGION VII
MR. DON J. PETERS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
KILGORE, TEXAS
(AC 214) 984-3071

REGION VIII
MR. THOMAS CARNEY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
MT. PLEASANT, TEXAS
(AC 214) 572-8676

REGION X
MR. H. W. GOODGION
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
RICHARDSON, TEXAS
(AC 214) 231-6301

REGION XI
MR. R. P. CAMPBELL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
FORT WORTH, TEXAS
(AC 817) 335-2441

Educational Personnel Development Consortium for Northeast Texas

education service centers
REGIONS VII, VIII, X, XI
the plus in education

DR. BILLY N. POPE
DIRECTOR
P. O. BOX 1300
400 EAST SPRING VALLEY
RICHARDSON, TEXAS 75080
(AC 214) 231-6301

TO THE VOCATIONAL HOMEMAKING TEACHER ADDRESSED:

As principal investigator for the Home Visitation project, I am sending copies of the enclosed survey to every useful homemaking teacher and combination useful/gainful homemaking teacher in Texas. The purpose of this project is to identify the current status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education. Perhaps Mrs. Elizabeth Smith's letter of support will indicate how important your response is. With your help, ideas for improving home visitations will be formulated.

Let me encourage you to respond to every item on the questionnaire. The time involved in completing the survey is brief. Participants in the pilot study reported that only 20-25 minutes were required to complete the questionnaire. Let me also assure you that the information collected will not be reported concerning an individual respondent. Your name appears on the questionnaire only for the purpose of follow-up.

I look forward to receiving your response within two weeks. A stamped envelope is included for your convenience. Please fold the instrument so that the return address appears in the envelope window.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by phone (214-231-6301) or mail. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brenda S. Mitchell

Brenda S. Mitchell
Principal Investigator
Home Visitation Project

BSM:ns
Enclosures

PARTICIPATING EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS

REGION VII

MR. DON J. PETERS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
KILGORE, TEXAS
(AC 214) 984-3071

REGION VIII

MR. THOMAS CARNEY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
MT. PLEASANT, TEXAS
(AC 214) 572-6676

REGION X

MR. H. W. GOODGION
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
RICHARDSON, TEXAS
(AC 214) 231-6301

REGION XI

MR. R. P. CAMPBELL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
FORT WORTH, TEXAS
(AC 817) 335-2441

Texas Education Agency

- STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
- STATE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
- STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

201 East Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas
78701

TO THE VOCATIONAL HOMEMAKING TEACHER ADDRESSED:

Homemaking teachers, school administrators, and Texas Education Agency staff members have expressed concerns during the last few years regarding the role of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. At present, a project is being funded by Texas Education Agency to identify the current status of home visitations. Every useful homemaking teacher and combination useful/gainful teacher in the state has been included in the survey.

I support the Home Visitation Project in conducting this survey. We at the Texas Education Agency look forward to reviewing the findings of this project, which will be useful in identifying contributions of home visits to the effectiveness of Homemaking Education; planning preservice education for prospective vocational homemaking teachers; and making decisions regarding needs, alternatives, resource materials, and improvements related to home visitations. I would like to encourage you to participate in this project by completing the survey instrument.

Thank you for your cooperation by participating in this worthwhile project. If I can be of assistance to you in any way, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth F. Smith

Mrs. Elizabeth F. Smith
Director, Homemaking Education

"An Equal Opportunity Employer"

APPENDIX B

VOCATIONAL HOMEMAKING EDUCATION
HOME VISITATION SURVEY

VOCATIONAL HOMEMAKING EDUCATION HOME VISITATION SURVEY

GENERAL INFORMATION AND DIRECTIONS:

This survey will help identify the current status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. As a result of this questionnaire, ideas for improving the home visitation component of Homemaking will be formulated.

PLEASE NOTICE THE FOLLOWING POINTS BEFORE YOU GO ON:

- **Home visit/visitation** means a visit with parents, guardians, and/or students which is conducted **only in the student's home.**
- **Home experience/extended learning experience** means a learning experience conducted during the student's time away from school.
- Your responses should reflect your current perceptions of home visitations for the 1978-1979 school year.

You are encouraged to share any experiences, ideas or materials related to home visitations. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Please fold this survey instrument so that the return address at the end of the questionnaire appears in the envelope window. Your prompt reply will be appreciated.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Please provide the following information:

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

(6-9)
- ____ Hmk. I
- ____ Hmk. II
- ____ Hmk. III
- ____ Hmk. IV

(10-15)
- ____ Home & Family Living
- ____ Home Furnishings
- ____ Home Management
- ____ Home Nursing
- ____ Child Development
- ____ Consumer Education

Teaching Assignment:

(16)
1 ___ Full unit
2 ___ Combination unit → (17)
1 ___ 10 month
2 ___ 11 month
3 ___ 12 month

Area in Texas:

(18-19)
____ 01 ____ 02 ____ 03 ____ 04 ____ 05
____ 06 ____ 07 ____ 08 ____ 09 ____ 10

Community Population:

(20)
1 ___ Less than 2,500
2 ___ 2,500 to 9,999
3 ___ 10,000 to 19,999
4 ___ 20,000 to 49,999
5 ___ 50,000 to 499,999
6 ___ 500,000 or more

Years of teaching experience in Vocational Homemaking in Texas including current year:

(21)
1 ___ 1
2 ___ 2-4
3 ___ 5-7
4 ___ 8-10
5 ___ 11-20
6 ___ Over 20

Highest Degree Earned:

(22)
1 ___ Bachelor's degree
2 ___ Master's degree
3 ___ Doctor's degree

Did you receive certification as a Vocational Homemaking Teacher in a Texas college or university?

(23)
1 ___ Yes
2 ___ No

PLEASE TURN PAGE →

HOME VISITATION SURVEY

Please answer the following questions concerning home visitations in Vocational Homemaking Education for the 1978-1979 school year.

1. Do you have a period designated for the purpose of home visitations in addition to a conference period?

(24) 1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

If yes, write which period of the school day is scheduled for home visitations.

(25) ☐

2. Is your period for home visitations adjacent to your conference period?

(26) 1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

3. Do you make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visitations?

(27) 1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

If yes, at what times? (Please check all that apply.)

(28-33)
____ Before school
____ Conference period
____ Lunch period
____ After school
____ At night
____ On weekends

4. What is the farthest distance traveled from your school headquarters to a home visit (one way)?

(34) 1 ____ 1-5 miles 3 ____ 11-15 miles 5 ____ Over 20 miles
2 ____ 6-10 miles 4 ____ 16-20 miles

5. Is your travel allowance adequate for making the home visits you have planned for this year?

(35) 1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

6. If you were to visit 100 percent of your students' homes, would it be necessary to request additional travel funds?

(36) 1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

7. How many home visits have you made for each of the first six months of this school year?

(37-42) ☐ August ☐ September ☐ October
(43-48) ☐ November ☐ December ☐ January

8. Approximately how many home visits do you think you will have made by the end of the regular school year? (49-51) ☐

What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits represent?

(52) 1 ____ 0-25% 3 ____ 51-75%
2 ____ 26-50% 4 ____ 76-100%

9. Do you visit the same home more than once during the regular school year?

(53) 4 ____ Always
3 ____ Usually
2 ____ Seldom
1 ____ Never

10. If you taught useful homemaking courses last year, how many home visits did you make during the 1977-1978 school year?

(54-56) ☐ Number of home visits
(57-59) ☐ Number of students enrolled during 1977-1978

11. If you conduct a summer homemaking program, do you visit a higher percentage of your students' homes in the summer than during the regular school year?

(60) 1 ____ Yes 3 ____ About the same
2 ____ No 4 ____ Not applicable

12. How many students are currently enrolled in your useful homemaking classes?

(61-62) ☐ Males
(63-64) ☐ Females

13. What is your estimate of the average time spent on a visit in the home?

(65) 1 ____ 15 minutes 4 ____ One hour
2 ____ 30 minutes 5 ____ 1½ hours
3 ____ 45 minutes 6 ____ Two hours or more

14. Please check all persons who are typically present when the home is visited.

(66-71)
____ Mother
____ Father
____ Guardian
____ Student
____ Other family member
____ Spouse of student

15. How important do you believe home visitations are to the total Vocational Homemaking program at your school?

(72) 4 ____ Very important
3 ____ Definitely important
2 ____ Somewhat important
1 ____ Unimportant

16. How important do you believe administrators (principals, vocational directors, superintendents, etc.) consider home visitations are to the total Vocational Homemaking program at your school?

4 ____ Very important
(73) 3 ____ Definitely important
2 ____ Somewhat important
1 ____ Unimportant

(80) [1]
Dup. (1-23)

17. Indicate the degree of encouragement you have received to do home visits from each of these individuals. (Please circle appropriate number. If no such position exists in your school, mark Not applicable.)

	Not applicable	No encouragement	Very little encouragement	Some encouragement	Extensive encouragement	
(24)	0	1	2	3	4	Home Economics Teacher Educator
(25)	0	1	2	3	4	Other Homemaking Teachers
(26)	0	1	2	3	4	Homemaking Department Chairperson
(27)	0	1	2	3	4	Homemaking City Supervisor
(28)	0	1	2	3	4	Vocational Administrator/Director
(29)	0	1	2	3	4	Area Homemaking Consultant
(30)	0	1	2	3	4	School Principal
(31)	0	1	2	3	4	Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent

18. Rate the adequacy with which your teacher education program prepared you to make home visits.

(32)
4 _____ Very well prepared
3 _____ Well prepared
2 _____ Somewhat prepared
1 _____ Inadequately prepared

19. Home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

(33)
4 _____ Strongly agree
3 _____ Agree
2 _____ Disagree
1 _____ Strongly disagree

20. How effective do you believe the Vocational Homemaking program would be without home visits?

(34)
4 _____ Very effective
3 _____ Definitely effective
2 _____ Somewhat effective
1 _____ Ineffective
0 _____ Would make no difference

21. How do home visits contribute to your total Vocational Homemaking program? (Please check all that apply.)

(35-46)
_____ 01. Aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interest of students
_____ 02. Aids in planning for relevant classroom activities and in developing and revising curriculum
_____ 03. Gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the Homemaking program
_____ 04. Identifies needs for adult work and YHT
_____ 05. Increases student self-concept and improves student and teacher relationships
_____ 06. Increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors
_____ 07. Increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment
_____ 08. Promotes understanding of FHA as an integral part of Vocational Homemaking programs
_____ 09. Provides better understanding of the community and its resources
_____ 10. Provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience
_____ 11. Provides opportunity to promote regular and summer programs and encourage future enrollment and planning
_____ 12. Provides students and parents with information regarding Vocational courses and careers

Write the number of the item listed above that you would consider the **main** purpose of home visits.

(47-48) [ ]

22. In what ways other than home visits do you contact parents or the home? (Please check all that apply.)

(49-58)
_____ Contacts in the community
_____ Drive through neighborhood
_____ FHA activities
_____ Homemaking department activities
_____ Parents serve as resource person
_____ PTA meetings
_____ Telephone conversation
_____ Visit at parent's place of employment
_____ Written correspondence
_____ Other school activities or events

23. What difficulties do you have related to home visitations? (Please check all that apply.)

(59-67)
_____ A barrier exists between parents and teacher when a language other than English is spoken in the home
_____ An invitation to visit the home is not extended
_____ Because of busing, some students attend a school outside their own neighborhood
_____ Distance to home visit is too far to travel and return during one period
_____ Majority of the period for home visits is used for other duties and activities related to the homemaking or school programs
_____ Parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours
_____ Parents and students misinterpret the purpose of home visits
_____ Some homes are located in areas that are considered to be unsafe to travel in alone
_____ Visiting with male student or father only is questionable

24. Rate your degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of your homemaking program.

(68)
4 _____ Very satisfied
3 _____ Definitely satisfied
2 _____ Somewhat satisfied
1 _____ Not satisfied

25. Would you be willing to make home visits if requested by students and parents, if no period were provided for making home visits?

(69)
1 _____ Yes
2 _____ No

26. Do you share information gained on the home visit with other school personnel?

(70)
4 _____ Always
3 _____ Usually
2 _____ Seldom
1 _____ Never

27. With which other school personnel might you share information obtained on the home visit? (Please check all that apply.)

(71-79)
_____ Area homemaking consultant
_____ Counselors
_____ Homemaking supervisor or vocational administrator/director
_____ Other homemaking teachers
_____ Other teachers in building
_____ Other vocational teachers
_____ Principal or assistant principal
_____ School nurse
_____ Other (Please specify) _____

(80) [2]
Dup. (1-23)

28. Do you have a method of recording specific information gained on the home visit other than the existing vocational homemaking reports?

(24)
1 _____ Yes
2 _____ No

29. Would an inservice workshop to develop skills and competencies for effective home visitations be helpful to you?

(25)
1 _____ Yes
2 _____ No

30. Would a teacher handbook for planning and preparing for effective home visitations be helpful to you?

(26)
1 _____ Yes
2 _____ No

PLEASE TURN PAGE

31. If an inservice workshop or a handbook were planned related to home visitations, which topics would be most helpful to you? (Please check all that apply.)

(27-40)

_____ Be alert to serious problems
_____ Deciding on Goals/Objectives/Strategies
_____ Do's and Don'ts
_____ Helping parents understand the program
_____ Ice breakers--Greetings
_____ Importance of a confident frame of mind
_____ Learning the neighborhood
_____ Making notes--Keeping records
_____ Materials to take
_____ Ready answers when parents ask
_____ Scheduling home visits
_____ Sharing information obtained
_____ Supervising and evaluating the home experience/ extended learning experience
_____ Other (Please specify) _____

32. What methods do you use to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience? (Please check the **three** most often used methods.)

(41-48)

_____ Class displays of individual work
_____ Class progress reports
_____ Home visit
_____ Individual student conference at school
_____ Telephone conversation
_____ Written evaluation from parents
_____ Written evaluation from students
_____ Other (Please specify) _____

33. In your class, can students receive credit for a useful homemaking course if they do not complete a home experience/ extended learning experience?

(49)

1 _____ Yes
2 _____ No

34. How important do you believe home experiences/extended learning experiences are to your homemaking program?

(50)

4 _____ Very important
3 _____ Definitely important
2 _____ Somewhat important
1 _____ Unimportant

35. Home experiences should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

(51)

4 _____ Strongly agree
3 _____ Agree
2 _____ Disagree
1 _____ Strongly disagree

(80) 3

PLEASE SHARE BELOW ANY EXPERIENCES, IDEAS, OR MATERIALS RELATED TO HOME VISITS. YOU MAY ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES IF NECESSARY.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THE HOME VISITATION PROJECT.

RETURN ADDRESS

Brenda S. Mitchell, Principal Investigator
EPD Consortium for Northeast Texas
P. O. Box 1300
Richardson, Texas 75080

PLEASE FOLD THE INSTRUMENT SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS APPEARS IN THE ENVELOPE WINDOW.

APPENDIX C

CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLES FOR THE VARIABLE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR WITH RESPECT TO SELECTED VARIABLES

TABLE XXIV

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION
OF RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS
REGARDING HOME EXPERIENCES/
EXTENDED LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Home experiences should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

Variable	Frequency	Per Cent
Strongly agree	367	20.9
Agree	772	44.0
Disagree	421	24.0
Strongly disagree	196	11.2

Number of Respondents
(N= 1756)

TABLE XXV

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOMEMAKING I)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Homemaking I					
Yes	439	296	274	270	1280
No	188	97	95	80	460
Total	628	393	369	350	1740

$X^2 = 12.63288^*$ df = 3

(number of missing observations = 39)

*significant at .01 level of significance

TABLE XXVI

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOMEMAKING II)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Homemaking II					
Yes	278	197	178	194	847
No	350	197	191	156	894
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 12.52534^*$ df = 3

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .01 level of significance

TABLE XXVII

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOMEMAKING III)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
Homemaking III	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Yes	96	82	60	87	325
No	532	312	309	263	1416
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 16.39848^*$ df = 3

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .01 level of significance

141

TABLE XXVIII

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOMEMAKING IV)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Homemaking IV					
Yes	3	9	2	6	20
No	625	385	367	344	1721
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 9.16282^*$ df = 3

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .05 level of significance

TABLE XXIX

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOME AND FAMILY LIVING)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Home and Family Living					
Yes	270	199	164	163	796
No	357	195	205	187	944
Total	627	394	369	350	1740

$X^2 = 8.38604^*$ df = 3

(number of missing observations = 39)

*significant at .05 level of significance

TABLE XXX

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOME FURNISHINGS)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Home Furnishings					
Yes	93	58	52	30	233
No	535	336	317	320	1508
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 9.0.879^*$ df = 3

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .05 level of significance

TABLE XXXI

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOME MANAGEMENT)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Home Management					
Yes	93	37	45	31	206
No	535	357	324	319	1535
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 10.74058^*$ df = 3

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .05 level of significance

TABLE XXXII

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOME NURSING)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Home Nursing					
Yes	25	10	20	19	74
No	603	384	349	331	1667
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

X^2 = 5.43218 df = 3

(number of missing observations = 38)

TABLE XXXIII

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (CHILD DEVELOPMENT)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Child Development					
Yes	132	58	67	49	306
No	496	336	302	301	1435
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 10.74971^*$ df = 3

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .05 level of significance

TABLE XXXIV

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (CONSUMER EDUCATION)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Consumer Education					
Yes	122	75	70	81	348
No	628	319	299	269	1393
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

X^2 = 3.01536 df = 3

(number of missing observations = 38)

TABLE XXXV

CHI SQUARE SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE VARIABLE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY ELEMENTS OF COURSES TAUGHT

Elements	Table Number	X^2	df
Homemaking I	XXVI	12.63*	3
Homemaking II	XXVII	12.53*	3
Homemaking III	XXVIII	16.40*	3
Homemaking IV	XXIX	9.16*	3
Home and Family Living	XXX	8.39*	3
Home Furnishings	XXXI	9.02*	3
Home Management	XXXII	10.74*	3
Home Nursing	XXXIII	5.43	3
Child Development	XXXIV	10.75*	3
Consumer Education	XXXV	3.02	3

*significant at .05 or less level of significance

TABLE XXXVI

FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY TEACHING ASSIGNMENT (FULL OR COMBINATION UNIT)

Teaching Assignment	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Full Unit	533	333	294	267	1427
Combination unit	86	51	71	78	286
No response	9	10	4	5	28
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 20.59926^*$ df = 6

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .01 level of significance

TABLE XXXVII

FOUR BY FOUR CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY TEACHING ASSIGNMENT (MONTHS OF CONTRACT)

Teaching Assignment	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
10 month	283	149	110	95	637
11 month	304	227	231	229	991
12 month	24	12	18	21	75
No response	17	6	10	5	38
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 48.36597^*$ df = 9

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .001 level of significance

TABLE XXXVIII

FOUR BY ELEVEN CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE
FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING
THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY AREA OF THE STATE

Area in Texas	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Area I	31	44	35	42	152
II	51	27	19	29	126
III	87	54	38	23	202
IV	38	28	38	42	146
V	142	53	26	22	243
VI	41	33	41	54	169
VII	70	39	56	39	204
VIII	31	36	41	45	153
IX	65	29	30	21	145
X	46	37	32	21	136
No response	26	14	13	12	65
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 170.85767^*$ df = 30

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .001 level of significance

TABLE XXXIX

FOUR BY SEVEN CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COMMUNITY SIZE

Community Population	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Less than 2,500	95	97	105	132	429
2,500 to 9,999	118	89	87	88	382
10,000 to 19,999	78	28	27	28	161
20,000 to 49,999	85	37	42	29	193
50,000 to 499,999	143	87	59	53	342
500,000 or more	64	35	24	12	135
No response	44	21	25	7	97
Total	627	394	369	350	1740

$X^2 = 114.20490^*$ df = 18

(number of missing observations = 39)

*significant at .001 level of significance

TABLE XL

FOUR BY SEVEN CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCE TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Years of teaching experience in Vocational Homemaking in Texas including current year

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
1	51	41	46	40	178
2-4	159	106	75	73	413
5-7	133	71	59	48	311
8-10	92	55	53	44	244
11-20	125	75	83	66	349
Over 20	67	42	52	77	238
No response	1	4	1	2	8
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 52.70805^*$ df = 18

(number of missing observations =

*significant at .001 level of significance

TABLE XLI

FOUR BY FOUR CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY DEGREES EARNED

Highest Degree Earned	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Bachelor's degree	463	290	263	242	1258
Master's degree	162	103	105	108	478
Doctor's degree	1	0	0	0	1
No response	1	1	1	0	3
Total	627	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 8.19441$ df = 9

(number of missing observations = 38)

TABLE XLII

FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY PRESERVICE TRAINING

Did you receive certification as a Vocational Homemaking Teacher in a Texas college or university?	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Yes	560	362	342	316	1580
No	68	31	27	34	160
No response	0	1	0	0	1
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 8.00865$ df = 6

(number of missing observations = 38)

TABLE XLIII

FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY SCHEDULING OF CONFERENCE PERIOD

Do you have a period designated for the purpose of home visitations in addition to a conference period?	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Yes	534	357	330	300	1521
No	89	36	35	46	206
No response	5	1	2	3	11
Total	628	394	367	349	1738

$X^2 = 21.76068^*$ df = 6

(number of missing observations = 41)

*significant at .01 level of significance

TABLE XLIV

FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY SCHEDULING OF CONFERENCE PERIOD

Is your period for home visitations adjacent to your conference period?

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Yes	180	127	146	119	572
No	409	252	209	206	1076
No response	37	15	14	24	90
Total	626	394	369	349	1738

$X^2 = 21.82666^*$ df = 6

(number of missing observations = 41)

*significant at .01 level of significance

TABLE XLV

FOUR BY SIX CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY DISTANCE TRAVELED TO HOME VISIT

What is the farthest distance traveled from your school headquarters to a home visit (one way)?	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
1-5 miles	143	61	38	29	271
6-10 miles	190	120	78	86	472
11-15 miles	124	100	101	84	409
16-20 miles	74	74	84	81	313
Over 20 miles	65	37	67	67	236
No response	32	2	1	3	38
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 144.01825^*$ df = 15

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .001 level of significance

TABLE XLVI

FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY ADEQUACY OF TRAVEL ALLOWANCE FOR MAKING HOME VISITS

Is your travel allowance adequate for making the home visits you have planned for this year?

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Yes	559	342	308	293	1502
No	54	48	57	55	214
No response	15	4	4	1	24
Total	628	394	369	349	1740

$X^2 = 26.89401^*$ df = 6

(number of missing observations = 39)

*significant at .001 level of significance

TABLE XLVII

FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL TRAVEL FUNDS

If you were to visit 100 percent of your students' homes, would it be necessary to request additional travel funds?

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Yes	415	255	217	143	1030
No	190	129	134	198	651
No response	23	10	18	9	60
Total	628	394	369	350	1741

$X^2 = 78.00066^*$ df = 6

(number of missing observations = 38)

*significant at .001 level of significance

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

TABLE XLVIII

FOUR BY FIVE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY VISITS MADE DURING SUMMER HOMEMAKING PROGRAM

If you conduct a summer homemaking program, do you visit a higher percentage of your students' homes in the summer than during the regular school year?

	What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Yes	211	146	137	102	596
No	59	34	33	41	167
About the same	46	38	56	81	221
Not applicable	276	151	119	108	654
No response	36	25	23	18	102
Total	628	394	368	350	1740

$X^2 = 83.33099^*$ df = 12

(number of missing observations = 39)

*significant at .001 level of significance

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, David McKay Co., Inc., 1971.

Charney, Leon and Edward LaCrosse, The Teacher of the Mentally Retarded, New York, John Day Co., 1965.

A Creative Approach to Special Staffing Problems: Staffing for Better Schools Under Title I, Washington, D.C., Education Service Bureau, Inc., 1970.

Hager, Donna L. and others, Community Involvement for Classroom Teachers, Charlottesville, Virginia, Community Collaborators, July, 1977.

Home-Oriented Preschool Education: Home Visitor's Handbook, Charleston, W. Va., Appalachia Educational Lab, 1972.

Home Visiting Handbook, Lakewood, Colo., Jefferson County Public Schools, 1976.

McCallon, Earl L., Planning and Conducting Surveys, Austin, Texas, Learning Concepts, Inc., 1978.

Nie, Norman H. and others, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1975.

Roscoe, John L., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Second Edition, Dallas, Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.

Articles

"Accountability: Home and School Visitor," Journal of International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers, Vol. 18, No. 2 (March, 1974), pp. 135-141.

Ade, William and James L. Hoot, "Parent Involvement: Motivation vs. Alienation," Day Care and Early Education, Vol. 4, No. 2 (November/December, 1976), pp. 19-20.

Beebe, Marian K., "Teachers and Parents Together," Today's Education, Vol. 65, No. 3 (September/October, 1976), pp. 74-79.

Brooks, B. David, "An Open Home Night - A Worthwhile Communication Vehicle," Journal of Educational Communication, Vol. 1, No. 2 (September/October, 1975), pp. 18-19.

Crosen, Roger L., "Home Visitation - A Chance for Counseling," Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 48, No. 12 (June, 1976), p. 282.

Gant, Walter L. and Greta I. Gustavson, "Home-School-Community: A Catalyst," Journal of International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers, Vol. 18, No. 2 (March, 1974), pp. 124-130.

Gilbert, Freeda M., "Home-School Counselor Assumes Important Role with Students, Parents," Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Spring, 1971), pp. 50-52.

Horn, Gunnar, "Home Visits," Today's Education, Vol. 59, No. 6 (September, 1970), pp. 44-46.

Huebner, Robert, "Planning and Assessing Accomplishment in Home-Based Intervention Programs," Child Welfare, Vol. 55, No. 10 (December, 1976), pp. 691-702.

Newbury, David N., "Community Education: Strategy for District-Wide Programs," Educational Leadership, Vol. 33, No. 5 (February, 1976), pp. 340-343.

Rafael, Berta, "The Advantages of Home Visits as a Pre-Admission Procedure," Teaching Exceptional Children, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Fall, 1970), pp. 12-16.

Rash, Dennis, "Know Your New Counselees Before School Begins," School Counselor, Vol. 18, No. 2 (November, 1970), pp. 133-134.

Shelton, Judith E. and Russell L. Dobson, "Family-Teacher Involvement: A Counselor's Key," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 8, No. 3 (March, 1974), pp. 190-196.

Simmons, J. C., "The Importance of Supervisory Visits," Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 44, No. 12 (June, 1972), pp. 313-314.

Swayze, Marian C., "Beginning in the Home - A New Dimension in Teacher Education," Viewpoints, Vol. 51, No. 1 (January, 1975), pp. 31-40.

DO NOT WRITE THIS PAGE

Van Berkum, Clifford, "Seven Kinds of Student Visitations," Agricultural Education, Vol. 48, No. 8 (February, 1976), pp. 188-191.

Wirt, Connie, "Communication through Home Visits by Teachers," Journal of Educational Communication, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1977), pp. 10-11.

Reports

Campbell, Sheila D. and Lorene M. Everett, In Home Early Childhood Project, Final Report, Edmonton, Department of Elementary Education, Alberta University, October, 1974.

Deloria, Dennis and others, The National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report V: Executive Summary - Policy Relevant Findings and Recommendations, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates Inc. Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1974.

_____, The National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report V: Summative Evaluation Results, Cambbridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc., Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1974.

Erickson, Edsel and others, Final Report of the Evaluation of the 1970-71 School-Home Contact Program, New York, Teaching and Learning Research Corp., 1971.

_____, Final Report of the Evaluation of the 1971-72 School-Home Contact Program, New York, Teaching and Learning Research Corp., 1972.

_____, School-Home Contact Program, 1972-73: Final Report, New York Teaching and Learning Research Corp., 1973.

Faulkner, Rosemary, Description and Evaluation of Training Program for Visiting Homemakers, Montauge, Prince Edward Island NewStart, Inc., 1971.

Gilmer, Barbara R. and others, Intervention with Mothers and Young Children: A Study of Intrafamily Effects, Nashville, Tenn., Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education, George Peabody College, 1970.

Gordon, Edmund W. and others, Ira Gordon Follow Through (Richmond, Virginia), New York, Columbia University, 1972.

DO NOT RUN THIS TAPE

Graves, Vivian, and others, Training Program for Family Day Care Home Mothers in the Pontiac Area, Rochester, Mich., School of Education, Oakland University, 1974.

Greenwood, Gordon E. and others, Assistance to Local Follow Through Programs, Annual Report, Gainesville, Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Institute for Development of Human Resources, Florida University, December, 1972.

Hicks, Leo B., An Experiment in School-Community Relations, Charleston, West Virginia State Commission on Mental Retardation, August, 1967.

Home-School Interaction: Project LEM, Hachensack Public Schools, New Jersey, 1973.

Home Start Evaluation Study, Interim Report III: Evaluation Plan 1973-74, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc., Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, August, 1973.

Jones, Elizabeth J., Preparing Teachers to Involve Parents in Children's Learning, Project Report, Pasadena, Cal., Pacific Oaks College, 1970.

Lambie, Dolores Z. and others, Home Teaching with Mothers and Infants, Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1974.

Lamont, Ken and Naomi Rice, Guidance Awareness Program: Narrowing the Gap Between Home and School: Final Report, Bend School District 1, Oreg., 1975.

Love, John M. and others, The National Home Start Evaluation Final Report: Findings and Implications, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Inc., Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1976.

_____, The National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report VII: Twenty-Month Program Analysis and Findings, Cambridge, Mass., ABT Associates, Ypsilanti, Mich., High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1976.

Murphy, Con, National Adult Education Survey, Interim Report, Dublin, Ireland, Ministry of Education, April, 1970.

Nardo, Nita, Home-Oriented Preschool Education: Personnel Training Guide, Charleston, W. Va., Appalachia Educational Lab, 1972.

DO NOT RUN THIS PAGE

Patterson, Irene, A Community Approach to Student Teaching, Research Report Number IV, College of Home Economics at Cornell University, State University of New York, June, 1966.

Peterson, M. Larry, The Effect of a Career Guidance Program Involving Teachers and Parents of Tenth Grade Students, Final Report, Logan City Board of Education, Utah, December, 1974.

POR FIN (Program Organizing Related Family Instruction in the Neighborhood), San Antonio, Texas, Bexar County Adult Continuing Education Program, 1971.

Progress Report of the Experimental Nursery School Program, 1964-65, Philadelphia School District, Pa., Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement, 1965.

Samples of Parent Permission Slip for Bus Trips, Sample of Home Visitation Report Form, and Sample of Letter to Parents Requesting a Home Visitation Used with Project Head Start, El Paso Public Schools, Texas, 1965.

Serrano, Tirso G., Project to Improve Equality of Educational Opportunities in Redlands, School Year 1969-70, Title IV Evaluation, Redlands Unified School District, Cal., November, 1970.

Shelton, Judith, An Analysis of a Family Involvement - Communication System in a Title I Elementary School, Final Report, Stillwater, Oklahoma State University, July, 1973.

Weeks, Ramona, Attacking Education Problems in Rural Schools, Florence, Ariz., Pinal County Schools, 1972.

White, Burton L. and others, Child Rearing Practices and the Development of Competence, Final Report, Cambridge, Mass., Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, December, 1974.

Publications of Learned Organizations

Berlin, Roxie and Irving N. Berlin, School's Training of Parents to be Effective Teachers of Their Own and Other Nonlearning Children, Seattle, University of Washington, 1973.

Guide for Planning Vocational Programs in Local Education Agencies, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1976.

Guide for the Administration of Travel of Vocational Personnel in Public Schools, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1976.

Guidelines for Extended Class Learnings, Olympia, Home and Family Life Division, Washington State Board for Vocational Education, 1971.

Honig, Alice S., Parent Involvement in Early Childhood Education, Washington, D.C., National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1975.

Learning: A Cooperative Adventure, A Resource Guide for Working with Young Children, Phoenix, Arizona State Department of Education, September, 1975.

Membership Directory, Texas Association of Directors, Supervisors, and Counselors of Vocational-Technical Education, Austin, Texas, 1978.

Pope, Edward V., Human Relations in Training Aides - A Guide for Extension Agents, Washington, D.C., Federal Extension Service, Department of Agriculture, July, 1969.

Reporting Pupil Progress in Special Classes for the Mentally Retarded, Special Education Curriculum Development Center, An Inservice Training Program, Des Moines, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Iowa City, Iowa University, October, 1968.

Rouls, Janalyce and others, Training Home Economics Program Assistants to Work with Low Income Families, Washington, D.C., Federal Extension Service, Department of Agriculture, November, 1965.

Sayler, Mary Lou, Parents: Active Partners in Education, A Study/Action Publication, Washington, D.C., American Association of Elementary, Kindergarten, and Nursery Educators, 1971.

Seefeldt, Carol and others, A Guide for Planning and Operating Home-Based Child Development Programs, Washington, D.C., Office of Child Development (DHEW), June, 1974.

Thomas, Susan B. and Janet Bowermaster, The Continuity of Educational Development, Urbana, Ill., ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, October, 1974.

Vacanti, Loretta, Parent-Generated Home-School Activities, Washington, D.C., Office of Education (DHEW), 1977.

DO NOT RUN THIS PAGE

Vocational Homemaking Education Program Standards, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1978.

Vocational Homemaking Teachers, Directory 1978-79, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1978.

Working with Parents, A Guide for Classroom Teachers and Other Educators, Washington, D.C., Association of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association, 1968.

Unpublished Materials

Ash, Lane and others, "New Fields of Employment and Vocational Training for Older Workers. Panel and Workshop V," unpublished papers presented at the National Conference on Manpower Training and the Older Workers, Washington, D. C., January 17-19, 1966.

Conley Virginia, "Come on, Parents, Participate," unpublished paper presented at Interdisciplinary Conference on Parenting, Atlanta, Georgia, February 21-22, 1977.

Gordon,Ira J. and others, "Continuity Between Home and School: Aspects of Parental Involvement in Follow Through," unpublished paper presented at the Biennial Southeastern Conference on Human Development, Atlanta, Georgia, April 27-29, 1978.

Priester, Jeanne, "An Identification of Effective Methods to Employ in Conducting an Educational Program to Reach and Teach Low-Income Young Homemakers in Rural Areas," unpublished paper presented at the National Seminar on Adult Education Research, Chicago, 1968.

Weikart, David P., "Has Preschool Compensatory Education Failed?" unpublished paper presented at the 1969 National Head Start Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1969.

_____, "Parent Involvement: Process and Results of the High/Scope Foundation's Projects," unpublished paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Denver, Colorado, April 10-13, 1975.

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE